Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at California State University, East Bay

April 2009
Overview of this Report

Overview of This Report
This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at California State University, East Bay. The report of the team presents findings based upon a thorough review of the Institutional Self-Study reports, supporting documentation, and interviews with representative constituencies.   Based upon the findings of the team, an accreditation recommendation is made for this institution of **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

Common (NCATE Unit) Standards and Program Standard Decisions
For all Programs offered by the Institution

	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	X		
2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluation		X	
3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	X		
4) Diversity	X		
5) Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	X		
6) Unit Governance and Resources		X	
CTC Common Standard 1.1 Credential Recommendation Process	X		
CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	X		

The state decision on NCATE/Common standards concurred with the NCATE recommendation for all standards, except for Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation which the NCATE team found "Not Met." Because the state Common Standard calls for both unit and program assessment and CSU East Bay had program assessment this standard was found to be "Met with Concerns."

Program Standards

Programs	Total Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple Subject, Multiple Subject w/BCLAD	21	21		
Single Subject	21	21		
Education Specialist: MM Level I	17	17		
Education Specialist: MM Level II	12	12		
Education Specialist: MS Level I	19	19		
Education Specialist: MS Level II	11	11		
Clear MS/SS Credential	4	4		
Reading Certificate and Reading Language Arts Specialist	20	20		
Preliminary Administrative Services	15	14	1	
Professional Administrative Services (standards based)	9	9		
Pupil Personnel Counseling: School Counseling	32	32		
Pupil Personnel: School Psychology w/Intern	27	27		
Clinical Rehabilitative Services: Speech Language Pathology	6	6		

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:
- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Institution:	**California State University, East Bay**
Dates of Visit:	**April 18-22, 2009**
Accreditation Team Recommendation:	**Accreditation with Stipulations**

Rationale:
The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; and additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards
The joint NCATE/CTC team found that all NCATE Unit/Common Standards were met except for Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation, and Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources which were met with concerns. These findings include the additional requirements from the California Common Standards that are not addressed by the NCATE standards.

Program Standards
All program standards in all programs were found to be met with the exception of Program Standard 7e in the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program. Standard 7e was met with concern. It states "Authentic and significant experiences addressing a variety of school levels and a variety of school settings are required for each candidate." Although graduates and field supervisors reported the field experiences were positive, evidence indicated that candidates usually perform field experience at only one school level.

Overall Recommendation
The team completed a thorough review of program documentation, evidence provided at the site, additional information provided by program administration and faculty, and interviews with candidates, program completers, faculty, administrators, employers and other stakeholders. Based upon this review the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation with Stipulations.**

Stipulations:

Standard 2: Unit Assessment and Evaluation

(1) That the College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS) develop and implement a unit-wide assessment system and apply that system across unit programs. The system is to include data collection related to unit outcomes, use of that data for unit improvement and provide a means for assessing the effectiveness of the system.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

Multiple Subjects
   Multiple Subjects
   Multiple Subject w/Intern
   Multiple Subject w/BCLAD (Spanish)
Single Subject
   Single Subject
   Single Subject w/Intern
Education Specialist
   <u>Preliminary Level I</u>
    Mild/Moderate
    Mild/Moderate w/Intern
    Moderate/Severe
    Moderate Severe w/Intern
   <u>Level II</u>
    Mild/Moderate
    Mild/Moderate w/Intern
    Moderate/Severe
    Moderate/Sever w/Intern

Reading Certificate
   Reading Language Arts Specialist
   Clear Credential (SB 2042 Fifth Year)
Administrative Services
   Preliminary Administrative Services
   Preliminary Admin w/intern
   Professional Admin (standards based)
Pupil Personnel Services
   School Counseling
   School Psychology
   School Psychology w/intern
Clinical Rehabilitative Services
   Speech Language Pathology
   School Psychology

(2) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.

- California State University, East Bay be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

- California State University, East Bay continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team

NCATE Team Leader/Co-Chair:	**Maureen Gillette** Northeastern Illinois University
California Co-Chair	**Mark Cary** Davis Joint Unified School District, Retired
Common Standards Cluster:	**Christy Faison** Rowan University
	Francine Peterman Cleveland State University
	Stacey L. Edmonson Sam Houston State University
	Rick Eigenbrood Seattle Pacific University
	Carol McAllister Los Alamitos Unified School District, Retired
	Yvonne Lux California Lutheran University
Teaching Credential Program Cluster:	**Marianne D'Emidio-Caston** Antioch University Santa Barbara
	Elizabeth Morris California Baptist University
	Patricia Wick University of Phoenix
	Judith Washburn California State University, Los Angeles
	Virginia Kennedy California State University, Northridge
	Robert Perry Los Angeles Unified School District
Advanced/Services Cluster:	**Margaret Dee Parker** California State University, Dominguez Hills
	Glee Brooks Simpson University
	Brad Allison California State University, Los Angeles
	Barbara Wilson California Department of Education, Retired
	Cathy Turney West Covina Unified School District

Staff to the Accreditation Team   **Cheryl Hickey,** Consultant

                                       Jo Birdsell, Consultant

Documents Reviewed

University Catalog	Schedule of Classes
Institutional Self Study	Advisement Documents
Course Syllabi	Faculty Vitae
Candidate Files	College Annual Report
Fieldwork Handbooks	College Budget Plan
Follow-up Survey Results	Program Assessment Documents
Needs Analysis Results	Biennial Reports
Field Experience Notebooks	

I
Interviews Conducted

	Team Leader	Common Standards	Basic Credential Cluster	Services Credential Cluster	**TOTAL**
Program Faculty	0	40	63	20	**123**
Institutional Administration	6	20	20	7	**53**
Candidates	6	15	106	66	**193**
Graduates	2	6	39	14	**61**
Employers of Graduates	4	1	21	8	**34**
Supervising Practitioners	0	1	51	36	**88**
Advisors	0	6	20	13	**39**
School Administrators	4	0	28	3	**35**
Credential Analysts and Staff	0	3	6	4	**13**
Advisory Committee	0	10	11	0	**21**
				TOTAL	**660**

Note: Individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Background information
California State University, East Bay (CSU East Bay) is a public, Carnegie II, regional, urban university and one of the 23 universities in the California State system. Established in Hayward, California in 1957 as the State College for Alameda County, it currently serves over 14,000 students at two sites, Hayward and Concord, as well as outreach programs in several centers and school districts throughout the region. The university offers 49 baccalaureate programs, 33 master's degree programs and a doctorate in Educational Leadership. CSU East Bay also offers 23 credential and certificate programs.

The mission of CSU East Bay is "to provide an academically rich, multicultural learning experience that prepares all its students to realize their goals, pursue meaningful life work, and to be socially responsible contributors to their communities, locally and globally." The student population at CSU East Bay is diverse: 12.4% African American, 25.4% Asian, Filipino, or

Pacific Islanders, 13.9% Hispanic, 25% White, less than 1% American Indian, 8% International, and 16% listed as "other." Sixty-two percent of the population is female.

The President and chief executive officer of CSU East Bay is Dr. Mohammed Qayoumi. The President reports to the Chancellor of the CSU system, and ultimately, the Board of Trustees. The chief academic officer, Provost Michael Mahoney, oversees the programs in the unit. The unit head, Dean of the College of Education and Allied Sciences (CEAS) reports directly to Dr. Mahoney. Since his arrival in 2006, President Qayoumi has worked with the university community to develop and implement a strategic plan as well as a diversity plan which is currently nearing the final stages of completion.

Education Unit
The professional education unit is comprised of programs in CEAS (Teacher Education, Educational Psychology, Educational Leadership) and in the College of Letters Arts and Social Science (Communication Sciences and Disorders). The interim dean of CEAS, Dr. Jodi Servatius, is the unit head. In fall 2008, the unit enrolled over 800 candidates in programs leading to a California certificate or credential.

CSU East Bay's education unit primarily serves a large geographic region that spans two counties, Alameda and Contra Costa counties. CSU East Bay has a center in Concord, California with no residence halls. Courses are offered primarily in the late afternoon and evening. The state chair visited this site and gathered information for the CTC-NCATE Common Standards as part of the review. The unit also has a partnership with West Contra Costa Unified school district to deliver courses in the district. Two team members visited this partnership site. The university also has a center in Oakland that was not a part of this visit, as it primarily provides continuing education and professional development courses.

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of Candidates Enrolled as of Fall 2008*	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs
Multiple Subject including interns	Initial	229	CTC
Single Subject including interns	Initial	166	CTC
Education Specialist M/M, M/S Level I including interns	Initial	50	CTC
Education Specialist M/M, M/S Level II	Advanced	36	CTC
Multiple and Single Subject Clear Credential Program (Fifth Year)	Advanced	16	CTC
Reading Certificate and Reading Language Arts Specialist	Advanced	23	CTC
Administrative Services: Preliminary and Professional Clear	Advanced	144	CTC
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	Advanced	36	CTC
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology	Advanced	16	CTC
Clinical Rehabilitative Services: Speech Language Pathology	Advanced	85	CTC

Data from Table OV.1 Overview of CSUEB Programs Subject to Review (NCATE/CTC Visit) provided by CSU East Bay.

The Visit

This was a joint visit with a team from the Commission on Teacher Credentialing using CTC standards for program review and an NCATE team that included two California team members who reviewed the NCATE Unit/CTC Common Standards. The NCATE and CTC teams met regularly during the visit to exchange information and cross verify findings. The existing state protocol was followed. There were no unusual circumstances affecting this visit.

NCATE STANDARDS/CCTC COMMON STANDARDS

STANDARD 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 1 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation and indicate the pages of the IR that are incorrect.)

<center>X   Yes   ☐   No</center>

If the answer is no, provide an explanation:

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:
Across the Initial Teacher Preparation (ITP) Programs, candidates demonstrate that they know the content they plan to teach and can explain important principles and concepts delineated in professional state and institutional standards. Each of the programs assesses and determines the extent of candidates' content knowledge in the following ways:
- In the Multiple Subject (MS) Teaching Credential Program, candidates must take the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) and the California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET). In 2007-2008, an 84% passage rate on the RICA was reported; in 2006-2007, a 99% passage rate was reported. In 2007-2008, an 100% passage rate on the CSET was reported.
- In the Single Subject Teaching Credential Program (SS), candidates may select one of two options: (a) to complete a state-approved Subject Matter Preparation Program (SMPP) or (b) to pass the CSET. In 2007-2008, CSET passage rate ranged from 85% to 100%.
- In the Mild-Moderate and Moderate-Severe Disabilities Credential Programs, candidates who do not already have a MS or SS credential must pass the same assessments and those for MS and SS and their scores are included among the scores for MS and SS candidates reported above.
- Candidates enrolled in the MM and MSD Specialist I programs (MMSI and MSDSI, respectively) who already have a credential were certified for having adequate content knowledge as a result of having achieved an initial credential.

In addition to test scores, signature assignments and Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) (beginning summer 2008) are used longitudinally across programs to assess candidates' content knowledge. In each program, rubrics have been designed and used on TaskStream to determine the level of candidates' content knowledge. These rubrics are aligned with the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) related to content knowledge. Ongoing analyses of candidates' performance

indicate that candidates know the content they plan to teach and can explain important principles and concepts delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. Analyses of relevant exit survey responses indicate that candidates feel confident about their content knowledge.

Based upon data provided in the Institutional Report (IR) and verified in Biennial Reports to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), 80% or more of the unit's program completers pass the content examinations or programs of study required for licensure. Further the CTC has determined that all standards for ITPs have been met and that candidates achieve the appropriate knowledge, skills, and abilities. All initial programs were found to have met all CTC standards by the state accreditation team.

Overall, across ITP programs, candidates demonstrate and feel confident in their content knowledge and can explain important principles and concepts that are delineated in professional, state and institutional standards. 80% or more of the unit's program completers pass the content examinations or courses of study required for licensure, demonstrating the extent of their content knowledge.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:
The unit offers several programs for advanced teacher preparation, including reading, educational technology, curriculum and instruction, and special education (Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe). Advanced candidates in all programs demonstrate content knowledge through coursework and project-based learning within their programs. Candidates have knowledge and understanding of state, professional, and programmatic standards and are able to put this knowledge into practice in their specific fields. Data from test scores required prior to admission to advanced programs show that candidates have sufficient content knowledge when they enter the advanced teacher education courses. Content knowledge that candidates are expected to know is reflected in course syllabi and signature assignments. All advanced programs were found to have met all CTC standards by the state accreditation team.

Programs for the preparation of other school personnel (OSP) include educational leadership (administrator preliminary and professional credentials), school counseling, school psychology, and speech-language pathology. OSP candidates exemplify an in-depth knowledge of their fields and can explain core concepts as outlined by state, professional, and programmatic standards. Documentation of proficiency in content knowledge is found in the forms of candidate grades, GPAs, surveys, comprehensive examinations, signature assignment performance evaluations, and field evaluations. All OSP programs were found to have met all CTC standards by the state accreditation team, except for one element of one standard in the administrator preliminary credential; this element related to the number and type of locations in which field experiences must take place and is not applicable to a NCATE standard.

Surveys of graduates indicate that graduates' preparation in the content areas in advanced programs was adequate and appropriate.

1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teachers – Initial Teacher Preparation		**X**	
1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teachers – Advanced Teacher Preparation		**X**	

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:
In each ITP program, a series of signature assignments are assessed on a 4- to 5-point scale;

Fieldwork evaluations are completed quarterly; and—in all but the Mild/Moderate Disabilities and Moderate/Severe Disabilities, TPAs are assessed on a 1- to 4-point scale. Most of these assessments are aligned with the TPEs, and include ongoing measures of TPE 1 (Pedagogical Skills), TPE 4 (Making Content Accessible), TPE 5 (Student Engagement), and TPE 6 (Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices)—which are directly related to the pedagogical content knowledge of the candidates. Across programs, most students score within the upper 2 levels of competence in these areas and score within 3.5 to 4 on each signature assignment. Programs periodically review fieldwork evaluations to assess candidates' breadth of knowledge and use of a variety of instructional strategies are determined by ratings on individual, relevant TPEs or program standards in M/M and M/S.

Candidates across programs achieve grades of A or B in their required TED 5110 Computer Technology course, in which candidates design and develop photo- and link-enriched websites, create weblogs and web-based project learning experiences, evaluate websites, and describe appropriate assistive technologies to improve access for students with disabilities. 73% of the MS graduates report feeling adequately prepared to use technology to enhance student learning.

Evidence is provided through the analysis of a variety of signature assignments. TPAs and field work evaluations indicate that candidates present content in clear and meaningful ways and integrate technology into teaching and learning. Feedback from recent graduates and their employers confirm the results of assessments.

Candidates demonstrate breadth of pedagogical content knowledge, including a variety of instructional strategies and the integration of technology into their teaching.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:
Candidates in advanced programs demonstrate an in-depth understanding of content and pedagogy related to learning through course performance and projects and action research projects. Candidates must earn a grade of B- or higher in order to receive credit for all courses; any course with a grade below B- must be repeated for no additional credit.

The candidate's ability to use technology to enhance student learning is evidenced through course-based artifacts and action research projects. Candidates complete course-based projects which are evaluated with detailed rubrics. All candidates are required to use a variety of technologies in the delivery of papers, projects, and presentations throughout their programs. Advanced candidates and alumni surveys confirm that candidates consider technology integration a useful experience from their graduate programs.

A review of candidates' artifacts and reflections of learning demonstrate that advanced level candidates are able to use a broad range of instructional strategies and technologies to promote student learning. Interviews with faculty, candidates, and graduates verify that each program requires candidates to demonstrate competency in all areas. Connection to the conceptual framework was less evident, although program assignments were consistently linked to professional, state, and specific program standards.

1c. Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge and Skills for Teachers – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
1c. Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge and Skills for Teachers – Advanced Teacher Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Candidates across programs longitudinally demonstrate their pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills in their completion of signature assignments, TPAs, and/or a standards-based portfolio (in M/M) and in quarterly Summative Field Experience Evaluations. These assessments and their evaluative criteria are aligned with professional, state, and institutional standards that are related to the facilitation of learning. Every program except M/M and M/S began using TPAs in addition to signature assignments in the summer of 2008. ITPs reported:

- MS candidates complete Mathematics Extended Lesson Plan, Case Study of a Struggling Reader, and English Language Development (ELD) Lesson Plan to demonstrate use of knowledge and skills related to psychological foundations, needs of diverse learners, professional responsibilities, assessment, and human and linguistic development. Average scores on these assessments in 2007 ranged from 3.74 to 3.83 on 4-point scale.
- SS candidates complete the Case Study and the ELD Lesson Plan to demonstrate their use of knowledge and skills related to psychological foundations, needs of diverse learners, professional responsibilities, assessment, and human and linguistic development. Average scores on these assessments in 2007 ranged from 3.62 to 3.7 on 4-point scale.
- M/M candidates submit a standards-based portfolio including evidence of creating positive learning environments, addressing developmental processes, enacting professional practices, assessing learning, and educating diverse learners while applying research and understanding of diverse students, families and communities. In 2007 and 2008, portfolios were assessed across 11 program standards and average scores were in the 3.5 to 3.8 range.
- M/S candidates complete two signature assignments, Inclusive Services Evaluation and Collaborative Consultative Process and Report in which they conduct and apply research and best practices related to their knowledge of learning and development, inclusive education, individualized planning, responsive teaching strategies, and professional collaboration. In 2008, candidates scored an average level of 3.94 and 3.87, respectively, on these signature assignments.
- In the summer of 2008, SS, MS, MMTE, and MSDTE candidates completed 4 TPAs. TPA 2, in particular, provides an analysis of candidates' use of research and best practices regarding learning and development, instructional strategies, adaptations for students with special needs and those who are English learners. During the first administration, 80% of the candidates met or exceeded minimum performance standards. Since 20% did not; coursework in learning, development, and English language learning was provided earlier in the programs to better prepare candidates for this particular TPA. Candidates who do not pass a TPA receive targeted instruction based upon the Record of Evidence that details how scores were derived in relation to TPEs.
- In each program, Summative Field Experience Evaluations provide focused feedback relevant to TPEs and program standards related to candidates' using professional content and pedagogical content knowledge in differentiating instruction based upon assessment, needs, and development while applying specific theories of schooling, learning, and

teaching in professional practice.

The TPAs and signature assignments (as evidenced in student work and their evaluations) require candidates to consider and use their understandings of diverse school, family, and community contexts along with the prior experiences of their students to develop, implement, assess, and reflect upon the meaningful learning experiences they create in their professional practice. Feedback from recent graduates and their employers confirm the results of assessments.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:
Candidates in advanced programs demonstrate their professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills through course-based projects, action research projects, and professional portfolios (portfolios are not required in all programs). Advanced level degree programs are structured according to discipline- or program-specific standards. Candidates take coursework aligned with their disciplines which requires them to reflect on their practices, to identify and address areas needing improvement, and to design instruction based on students' prior experiences. Emphasis is also placed on effective practices for working with special populations, specifically struggling learners and English learners.

Various projects and assignments were found in the document room as evidence of candidate competency related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Advanced level candidates are required to reflect on their professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills; candidates also connect their learning to professional and programmatic standards, although limited connection was made between these reflections and the conceptual framework. Advanced candidates perform well on their signature assignments, with average scores from 3.51 to 3.72 on a 4.0 scale. Some advanced programs also require professional portfolios that are used to measure professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Average candidate scores on portfolio evaluations were strong.

1d. Student Learning for Teachers – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
1d. Student Learning for Teachers – Advanced Teacher Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:
Throughout the ITP programs, candidates complete a variety of signature assignments and 4 TPAs (except MMSI and MDSSI) as well as submit a standards-based teaching portfolio (MMSI only), demonstrating the ways in which they focus on student learning. Overall, in each program, candidates are assessed quarterly on Summative Field Experience Evaluations that include feedback regarding their use of assessment to refine instructional strategies to be responsive to their students' learning. ITP programs use the following assessments to substantiate that candidates focus on student learning, using assessments and their analyses to monitor student progress and make appropriate adjustments to instruction, as well as to create meaningful learning experiences for students:

- MS candidates complete 3 signature assignments. The Mathematics Extended Lesson Plan requires the differentiation of instruction for English learners and students with other needs, using information about developmental levels and prior experience to create, implement, and reflect upon meaningful lessons. While implementing these plans, candidates monitor student learning and make appropriate adjustments in response to difficulties students encounter and the results of assessments. The Case Study of a Struggling Reader requires candidates to use the results of reading assessments to responsively, skillfully support a student who encounters specific reading difficulties.

The ELD Lesson Plan requires candidates apply specific knowledge of English learners and create, implement, and assess an engaging, responsive lesson including differentiated objectives for English learners. Candidates' scores on these assignments ranged on average from 3.74 to 3.83, suggesting a high level of performance in using assessment to create, implement, and reflect upon meaningful lessons in which assessment is used to differentiate and monitor learning experiences.

- SS candidates complete 2 signature assignments, including the Mathematics Extended Lesson Plan and the Case Study of a Struggling Reader described in the previous paragraph. Candidates' scores on these assignments ranged in average from 3.62 to 3.77, reflecting high levels of competency in using assessment to create, implement, and reflect upon meaningful lessons in which assessment is used to differentiate and monitor learning experiences.
- MMSI candidates submit a standards-based portfolio in which they document creating positive learning environments, assessing learning and instruction, and educating diverse learners. The subset of outcomes met in accomplishing these standards include using assessment as a basic for instruction, using assessment to design successful instructional strategies, and individualizing and modifying instruction as a result of assessing student learning, The average score across the 11 standards used to assess the portfolio approaches 4.0, indicating high levels of competence in these areas.
- MSDSI candidates complete the Inclusive Services Evaluation using assessment to collaboratively differentiate instruction and monitor learning to accomplish specific outcomes and modify plans. Candidates' scores on this assignment averaged 3.94, indicating high levels of competency in using assessment to create, implement, and reflect upon meaningful lessons in which assessment is used to differentiate and monitor learning experiences.

ITP candidates focus on students' learning, using assessment to monitor student learning and adjust instructional practices to address individual learning differences and needs while creating engaging and meaningful learning experiences for their students.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation: In advanced programs, the candidate's ability to impact student learning is measured using course-based assignments and experiences. A variety of artifacts such as case studies, assessments, and instructional planning are used to assess student learning. Candidates in advanced program are required to extend and refine skills in using student data to improve instruction in their current course assignments. For example, an action research project requires advanced candidates to conduct a research study to improve students' learning in their classroom settings. Additionally, evidence of advanced candidates' abilities to help all students to learn was provided through course-based projects and field experience requirements.			
1e. Professional Knowledge for Other School Professionals		X	
Summary of Findings: The unit offers several programs for other school professionals (OSP), including school counseling, school psychology, speech language pathology, reading, and educational leadership (administrator licensing). Each of these OSP programs requires project-based course activities and experiences that increase and enhance candidate knowledge and skills. Professional standards found within each program guide how knowledge and skills are developed and integrated			

throughout the curricula. Sample assignments from OSP candidates presented in the document room indicate that candidates demonstrated professional practice through reflection, field-experiences, and course activity.

Evidence that candidates in programs for other school professionals are knowledgeable in their field, can apply professional standards, and use research to improve practice is provided through a variety of assessment methods such as scores on licensure exams, case studies, action research projects, successful completion of portfolio requirements, and exit surveys. Biennial CTC reports for each program provide evidence that candidates are assessed regularly and must demonstrate acceptable levels of competency at each phase of the program in order to graduate. In programs where licensure exams are required (PRAXIS), passing rates for all candidates exceed 80 percent.

With respect to technology, candidates use a variety of technologies in the delivery of papers, projects, and presentations through coursework specific to their area of study. All candidates are required to demonstrate competency using TaskStream and Blackboard, as well as word processing, spreadsheets, PowerPoint and multimedia in assignments. A review of biennial program reports, syllabi, program-specific artifacts, and portfolios as well as interviews with faculty and candidates document each program requires candidates to demonstrate competency in all areas.

All OSP programs were found to have met all standards by the California state accreditation team (Commission on Teacher Credentialing), except for one element of one standard in the administrator preliminary credential; this element related to the number and type of locations in which field experiences must take place and is not applicable to a NCATE standard. In addition, the speech-language pathology program is accredited by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA).

1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals		X	

Summary of Findings:
Candidates in advanced programs for other school professionals demonstrate their ability to create positive learning environments for students; build on developmental levels of students; and understand community, family and community diversity as they complete the signature assignments required by each program. A review of CTC biennial program reports, syllabi, and program-specific artifacts, as well as interviews with faculty and candidates, confirm that each program requires candidates to demonstrate competency in all areas.

1g. Professional Dispositions		X	

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation
Each ITP program delineates specific professional dispositions that are aligned with the unit's conceptual framework and professional and state standards. These dispositions appear in program handbooks, are reflected in program and unit outcomes and the unit's mission statement and are clearly represented in interview protocols for students entering the MMSI and MSDSI program. Candidates in all programs must demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with the ideal of fairness and the belief that all students can learn.

The MS and SS programs are aligned with TPEs 4, 5, 7, 8, 11 and 12, requiring the candidates to create equitable and productive social environments, promote equity and fairness, and take responsibility for students' academic learning, be aware of their own values and biases and how they may affect learning, resist racism and intolerance, and enact strategies consistent with legislated equity for all learners. The designated dispositions are assessed in the MS and SS programs on the required TPAs and on Summative Field Experience Evaluations, especially in regards to TPEs 4, 5, 7, 8, 11 and 12 which are directly related to the designated dispositions.

MMSI candidates are required to demonstrate respect for personal, family, and community values, to handle professional responsibilities in an ethical manner, and to respond and adapt to changing situations. In 2007, all candidates were rated acceptable to exemplary in relation to these dispositions.

MSDSI candidates are expected to believe that all students can learn and have strengths and interests that impact learning and demonstrate professional behaviors, fairness, equity, and acceptance of differences in students' attitudes, interests, learning styles, an abilities. Entrance interviews determine candidates' dispositions, and a rubric is applied to their verbal responses. In 2006, 4 candidates scored a 2.75 on a 3.0 scale. The interview protocol was not applied prior to that year. No data were provided for 2008. In 2007, all candidates were rated acceptable to exceeds expectations in relation to these dispositions.

Throughout ITP programs, signature assignments and other coursework require candidates to work with students, families, colleagues and communities in ways that promote equity and fairness and demonstrate their belief that all students can learn. Candidates differentiate instruction based upon individual, cultural, and linguistic difference; collaborate with colleagues and families to ensure equity and excellence; and consistently express respect for family and community values in their development of responsive instruction and reflections upon their lessons. Summative Field Experience Evaluations across ITP programs provide ongoing feedback and supportive documentation regarding TPEs and program outcomes related to these dispositions.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation
Dispositions of candidates are assessed throughout the advanced programs, both formally and informally. Faculty and school personnel evaluate the demonstration of dispositions. Feedback is provided about candidate progress when problems become evident through student behaviors. Candidates write philosophy statements and must demonstrate appropriate belief systems related to the capacity of teaching all children.
Dispositions checklists were available in many program biennial reports. Measurement of dispositions also takes place via field experience or internship evaluation instruments completed by unit faculty and field-based supervisors to assess the professional dispositions of candidates. Completed examples of these measurements were not provided.

A review of the data and interviews with faculty and candidates indicate that programs have specific expectations for candidate dispositions but that the evaluation and measurement of these dispositions varies among programs. Interviews with graduates, faculty, program coordinators, and department chairs indicate that dispositions in many programs are measured informally, with no mechanism for addressing candidates who may have problems with demonstrating appropriate

dispositions. Although instruments for measuring dispositions appeared in some CTE biennial reports, examples of how these instruments were used were not provided.

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals
Programs for the preparation of Other School Professionals ensure that candidates know and demonstrate content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. A variety of program-level assessments are used to enhance candidate preparation.

Overall Assessment of the Standard
ITP candidates demonstrate consistently that they have the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and the pedagogical and professional knowledge required for teachers to assure that all students can learn and that equity and fairness are enacted in their lessons and learning environments. They use assessments to monitor student learning and learning styles and needs and use the results of such evaluations to differentiate instruction accordingly. ITP candidates not only explore their own values but those of their students, their families and communities, expressing respect for values by creating responsive learning experiences that engage students in meaningful learning.

Programs for the preparation of initial and advanced teacher candidates as well as other school professionals ensure that candidates know and demonstrate content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. At the program level, two years of data were not provided.

NCATE Recommendation for Standard 1 Initial - Met
NCATE Recommendation for Standard 1 Advanced – Met

State Team Decision: Met

Corrections to the Institutional Report: None

STANDARD 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 2 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation and indicate the pages of the IR that are incorrect.)

X   Yes   ☐   No

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
2a. Assessment System – Initial Teacher Preparation	X		
2a. Assessment System – Advanced Preparation	X		

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation
Each program at the initial level has program assessments that include candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions. However, the unit does not have a comprehensive unit-wide assessment system aligned with the Conceptual Framework which describes the gathering of assessment data on applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, graduate performance, faculty performance, and program quality. For example, when the team asked for items such as aggregated data related to faculty scholarship, unit grants, or budget, we were often told to look in the file on individual faculty members or speak to individuals about the issue. While the Institutional Report discusses in detail how the unit assessment system was revised and developed since the last accreditation visit with input from core faculty, program liaisons in the unit, and other stakeholders (field partners and students), there was little evidence of how this occurred. Interviews with program faculty indicated that they did not understand the need to collect, aggregate, and analyze data at the unit level.

However, evidence from interviews with faculty and students indicates that assessment at the initial program level is strong and that each of the initial programs has program assessment systems that were developed with input from faculty and the professional community. The biennial reports, which are required for each program, do provide additional evidence of how assessment of candidate skills, knowledge, and dispositions are gathered for each program in the unit. Each of the initial programs have identified and collect assessment data at five stages – admission, entry to clinical practice, exit from clinical practice, program completion, and after program completion (table 6, IR). Data are gathered from multiple resources including candidates and graduates, faculty, and outside professional community sources, and sources include key assessments or measures at each stage.   The following is a summary of assessment for each of the transition points in the initial programs:

1. Admission: Assessments and measures include minimum GPA, basic skill proficiency (CBEST), content area knowledge (CSET), and pre-admission field experience.
2. Entry to Clinical Practice: Assessments include passing scores on "signature assignments," minimum grade expectations in required courses, summative evaluations by

       master teachers and university supervisors in first field placement, and passing scores on the TPA (single and multiple subject credentials only).

3. Exit from clinical practice: Assessments and measures include scores on signature assignments, TPA evaluation (single and multiple subject credentials only) and course grades.
4. Program Completion: Assessments include summative evaluation by the master teacher and university supervisor, and the TPA evaluation.
5. After Program Completion: Assessments include the CSU Exit Survey for Program completers and the CSU System-wide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation of first year teachers and Supervisors of first-year teachers.

Assessments that are being used to gather student outcome data include both required assessments which have been developed and vetted for fairness, reliability, and validity outside of the university (e.g. CBEST, CSET, and CalTPA) and program assessments that have been developed by faculty within the various programs (e.g. signature assignments). Interviews with faculty and program chairs indicated that there have been efforts to ensure that various initial program assessments developed within the unit are consistent, fair, reliable and valid including rubric training and character trait analysis where the rubrics have evolved from global assessment to more specific elements for each signature assignment. In spite of these efforts, interviews with faculty and field experience supervisors indicate there remain concerns about inter-rater reliability of measures and evaluation inflation which has resulted in very little variance in some measures such (e.g. summative evaluations).

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals
While the assessment of candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions occurs throughout the program level, the unit does not have a comprehensive unit-wide assessment system aligned with the conceptual framework which describes the gathering of assessment data on applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, graduate performance, faculty performance, and program quality. The Institutional Report discusses in detail how the unit assessment system was revised and developed since the last accreditation visit. Input from core faculty, program liaisons in the unit, and other stakeholders (field partners and students) provided little evidence of how this occurred. Interviews with program faculty indicated that they did not understand the need to collect, aggregate, and analyze data at the unit level.

Evidence from interviews with faculty and students indicates that assessment at the advanced program level is strong and that each of the advanced programs has program assessment systems that were developed with input from faculty and the professional community. The biennial reports, which are required for each advanced credential program, do provide additional evidence of how assessment of candidate skills, knowledge, and dispositions are gathered for each program in the unit. Each of the advanced programs have identified and collect assessment data at five stages – admission, entry to clinical practice, exit from clinical practice, program completion, and after program completion (table 6, IR). Data are gathered from multiple sources including candidates and graduates, faculty, and outside professional
community sources, and include key assessments or measures at each stage. Though the data collected for the various advanced program varies somewhat, the following is a summary of assessment for each of the transition points.

1. Admission: Assessment may include minimum GPA, graduate exam scores (e.g. GRE, MAT), and interviews. For some of the advanced programs admission criteria are limited to completion of the previous licensure requirements (e.g. Education Specialist II for special education).

2. Entry to Clinical Practice: Assessments during this stage may include assessments on "signature assignments" specific to the candidate's program, and minimum course grades.

3. Exit from Clinical Practice: Assessment items may include course grades, and signature assignments.

4. Program Completion: Assessments may include clinical practice evaluations, and specialty tests (e.g. ASHA exam for SLP).

5. After Program Completion: Assessments include exit surveys and alumni surveys.

Assessments that are being used to gather student outcome data include both required assessments which have been developed and vetted for fairness, reliability, and validity outside of the university (e.g. ASHA exam), and program assessments that have been developed by faculty within the various programs (e.g. signature assignments). Interviews with faculty and program chairs indicated that there have been efforts to ensure that various initial program assessments developed within the unit are consistent, fair, reliable and valid including rubric training and character trait analysis where the rubrics have evolved from global assessment to more specific elements for each "signature assignment" assessment. In spite of these efforts interviews with faculty and field experience supervisors indicate there remain concerns about inter-rater reliability of measures and evaluation inflation which has resulted in very little variance in some measures such (e.g. intern evaluations).

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, & Evaluation– Initial Teacher Preparation	**X**		
2b. Data Collection, Analysis, & Evaluation– Initial Teacher Preparation – Advanced Preparation	**X**		

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation

The Unit Assessment and Accreditation Task Force (UAATF) is responsible for the maintenance and consistent implementation of the unit-wide assessment system, while program chairs/coordinators and liaisons, who are all members of the UAATF, have oversight of the implementation of the assessment activities of each program. Data on candidate admission qualifications, and candidate proficiencies (skills and knowledge) are collected each quarter as candidates move through the different stages of the program. Data on candidates are gathered through multiple measures using both internal and external sources to include candidates, faculty, supervising mentor teachers, university mentors, graduates, employers, and others in the professional community, including the annual CSU system wide one-year out survey of initial credential program completers and employers.

Though the initial programs recently placed a portion of their data on-line using Share Point in preparation for the accreditation visit, it is evident that the unit or individual programs have not

made use of a electronic data-base that would make aggregated data available to faculty. The unit did recently adopt TaskStream, an electronic assessment and data gathering system, which allows candidates to post signature assignments that are then evaluated by instructors. TaskStream can be used to collect, compile and analyze data on signature assignments. However, data gathered through assessments are not organized in a central location that would allow for the collection, compilation, aggregation, summary, and analysis of data for the purpose of improving candidate performance, and program quality.

There is no evidence that data for off-campus, different campus programs, or cohorts are being disaggregated.

There is no evidence that analysis of the unit operation and quality data is occurring at this time. However, liaisons for each program are responsible for reviewing data with program faculty and through the state required biennial reports. There is no evidence that reviews of assessment results are being shared with unit committees or advisory committees.

The unit has a formal policy for formal complaints (Academic Appeals by Students), and maintains a record of formal complaints and resolutions.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals
The Unit Assessment and Accreditation Task Force (UAATF) is responsible for the maintenance and consistent implementation of the unit-wide assessment system, while program chairs/coordinators and liaisons, who are all members of the UAATF, have oversight of the implementation of the assessment activities of each program. Data on candidate admission qualifications, and candidate proficiencies (skills and knowledge) are collected each quarter as candidates move through the different stages of the program. Data on candidates are gathered through multiple measures using both internal and external sources to include candidates, faculty, field experience supervisors, university mentors, graduates, employers, and others in the professional community, including annual follow-up surveys of program completers.

Though the advanced programs did recently place a portion of their data on-line using Share Point in preparation for the accreditation visit, it is evident that the unit or individual programs have not made use of an electronic database that would make aggregated data available to faculty.

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement – Initial Teacher Preparation	X		
2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement – Advanced Preparation	X		

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation
Initial programs make systematic use of assessment data gathered from students, graduates, and faculty to evaluate the effectiveness of various elements of its programs. However, there was no evidence that assessment data are gathered at the unit-wide level to improve programs or unit operations. Data were provided for one year across programs.

The Institutional Report, interview with faculty, and other evidence indicates that faculty within the various programs do regularly review assessment data and use the results to make program changes within the various initial programs. For example, in the mild-moderate initial special

education program course were modified to provide more opportunities for lesson planning, and implementation.

While, as indicated in the previous program, faculty do regularly review assessment data, the data is not accessible to all faculty on a regular basis

---

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals
Advanced programs make systematic use of assessment data gathered from students, graduates, and faculty to evaluate the effectiveness of various elements of their programs. However, there was no evidence that assessment data are gathered at the unit-wide level to improve programs or unit operations. Data were provided for one year across all programs.

The Institutional Report, interviews with faculty, and other evidence indicates that faculty within the various programs do regularly review assessment data and use the results to make program changes within the various advanced programs.

While faculty regularly review program assessment data, the data is not accessible to all faculty on a regular basis.

Overall Assessment of the Standard
Though it is clear that there is a culture of assessment throughout the programs in the unit that has resulted in significant use of assessment procedures to assess candidate and program effectiveness, there is no unit-wide assessment system that is aligned with the conceptual framework and used to evaluate programs, unit operation, and quality. In addition, the current assessment activities are not making effective use of electronic technology to maintain and make available aggregated data across programs and for unit operations.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

- AFIs corrected from last visit - None
- AFIs continued from last visit - None
- New AFIs -

1. The unit assessment system does not include comprehensive and integrated assessment and evaluation measures to manage and improve unit operations and programs.

   Rationale: While assessment of candidate skills, knowledge, and dispositions occur at the program, the unit has not developed and implemented a unit-wide assessment system that assesses program and unit operations.

2. The unit assessment system is not aligned with the conceptual framework.

Rationale: Though the unit was able to provide the team with matrices that align specific assessments with the conceptual framework, no such alignment was evident at the unit level (i.e., unit operations).

3. The unit assessment system is not regularly evaluated by the faculty and professional community.

    Rationale: Examination of on-line (Sharepoint) documents and interviews with faculty, program chairs, and unit leadership provided no evidence of faculty or professional community evaluation of a unit-wide assessment data.

4. The unit does not have procedures that describe how candidate assessment will be compiled, aggregated, summarized, and analyzed at the unit level to improve unit operations.

    Rationale: It is expected that data collected will inform unit operations and should be compiled and aggregated so that key elements of unit operation can be assessed and used for unit improvement. Such gathering, compiling, and analyzing of unit operational data is not currently available.

5. The unit does not have procedures at the unit level that provide faculty access to aggregated assessment data and data systems.

    Rationale: In order for aggregated assessment data to be useful for program and unit improvement, it necessary that faculty have efficient access to such data. While the Sharepoint system and the current data management system (i.e., Task Stream) will eventually be tools for the ongoing sharing of data across the unit, they are not currently providing organized, consistent, and comprehensive program and unit data to faculty.

6. The unit does not disaggregate data across off-campus sites, cohorts, or fully on-line program offerings.

    Rationale: Interviews with faculty and program coordinators indicate that programs are being offered in entirely on-line. Additionally, programs in the unit use a cohort model. NCATE standards require that assessment data be disaggregated in such instances.

7. Aggregated program data was limited to one year of data.

    Rationale: As Standard 1 indicates, no program was able to provide two years of aggregated data across each transition point. One year of data of data was consistently provided. NCATE requires two years of data be reported at this time.

Recommendation for Standard 2 Initial Teacher Preparation: Not Met
Recommendation for Standard 2 Advanced Preparation: Not Met

State Team Decision: Met with concerns

Rationale: Although team members found sufficient evidence of assessment activities within programs, no unit-wide assessment system for ongoing unit evaluation and improvement was articulated or implemented.

Corrections to the Institutional Report: None

STANDARD 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 3 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation and indicate the pages of the IR that are incorrect.)

<div align="center">X   Yes   ☐   No</div>

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
3a. Collaboration between Unit & School Partners – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
3a. Collaboration between Unit & School Partners – Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation

Field experiences and clinical practices are a fundamental component for all teacher candidates and candidates for other school personnel roles. The unit has partnerships with over 36 schools and education agencies in the local area and provides Memorandums of Understanding to outline the terms of the relationship which can include the placement of candidates and selection of master teachers or intern support providers. Long term partnerships exist within both Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. Many sites, especially in West Contra County Unified School District, have been receiving student teachers and interns and advanced credential candidates for a number of years.

Faculty, team leaders and field supervisors within the unit collaborate with school partners regarding candidate placement and assessing candidate progress. Representatives from field placements and clinical practices provide input and feedback to the unit to help ensure success for the candidates based on agreed upon standards and elements of the conceptual framework.

Candidates in initial programs are consistently placed in field experiences that allow them to apply the knowledge, skills and dispositions they developed in foundation and content specific coursework.

The process used for the placement of interns in the Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential programs in West Contra County Unified School District demonstrates the collaboration between school districts and the program. Before a candidate's placement is determined, the Director of Field Experiences and the school district administrator review the prospective candidate's application. The candidate is interviewed by a site administrator with final placement determined after the site administrator determines the prospective candidate is a "fit" with that site. Interns are then employed by the school district and work on completion of their credential during their first year of employment. Multiple subject credential candidates are partnered with an intern support provider at their school as well as a field supervisor from CSUEB.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals

Candidates in advanced programs, such as the Speech Pathology program, are placed as interns through a mutual agreement between the program and partner. Typically, the Clinical Director contacts a school partner to request a placement. Candidates in the Administrative Services programs complete their field experiences often in the school of their current employment. When the need arises for a different placement, the program works with the candidate to find an alternative placement to meet the requirements for experiences that provide the opportunity to work with students at a range of grade levels different from their current school site. The School Counseling Program is working with the Hayward Unified School District which was recently awarded a three-year grant to align school counseling programs with the ASCA National Model. The grant targets K-12 school counseling services especially defined for students at risk. Candidates participating in this program are given the opportunity to participate in this grant to help build connections between theory and application in the field, as well as developing reflective practice skills.

3b. Design, Implementation, & Evaluation of Field Experiences & Clinical Practices – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
3b. Design, Implementation, & Evaluation of Field Experiences & Clinical Practices – Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation

The design, delivery and evaluation of field experiences and clinical placements are a joint venture. Unit program coordinators, faculty, university team leaders, district level administrators, site administrators, and master teachers work together in designing, delivering and evaluating programs.

Initial programs have their own structure of entry and exit requirements for field experiences and clinical practice. In the Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential program, candidates must have completed 45 hours of successful classroom-like field experience with children ages 5 – 11 prior to entry into the program. They must also demonstrate basic academic skills to demonstrate potential for professional effectiveness. During their field experience, their fieldwork is designed so they are in two different grade level placements over the course of three quarters. One of the placements must be with a substantial number of English learners to meet diversity requirements. They must also be formally observed by their field supervisor four times. During these observations, they demonstrate they can effectively teach a lesson using the California content standards, teach to a specific objective and assess students learning to check for understanding. The field supervisor uses these observation opportunities to see how the candidate is progressing toward meeting the thirteen Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) for the teaching profession. Assessments for methods courses are all completed in the context of the candidate's field placement. Across the program, fieldwork responsibilities increase with each subsequent quarter. However, if a particular concern about a candidate's success arises, site supervisors, master teachers or clinical faculty work to develop a plan of action for improvement.

In both the Education Specialist Level I Mild-Moderate and Moderate-Severe programs, program partners provide input into course design and content. Field supervisors and master teachers work with candidates on various service delivery models with all candidates demonstrating

successful completion of general education fieldwork prior to their fieldwork experience in special education. Throughout field experiences, they must demonstrate the ability to deliver high caliber services of instruction to students with special needs and the ability to carry out an individualized instruction intervention plan based on assessment findings.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals

Each advanced program also has set requirements during the field experiences including guidelines for integrating the use of technology to enhance instruction. Candidates in the Speech Pathology program work with the Clinic Director and personnel at the partner school sites. Candidates participate in two ten week, full-time internship experiences in two settings: one medical and one school. Candidates are observed and evaluated on how well they do in each of these settings. Interviews with course instructors, supervisors, and candidates validate that clinical practice progresses systematically from observation to full implementation.

Candidates applying for the Reading Credential must have a 3.0 GPA or better in the last 90 quarter units of coursework; possess a teaching credential, and three letters of recommendation. To move to clinical practice, they must pass a Fluency Lesson Project with an acceptable score and demonstrate critical thinking skills in evaluating a beginning reader. Throughout the program they must complete clinical practices that demonstrate their ability to provide reading assessments and remedial instruction methods for diverse populations. Candidates in the advanced programs demonstrate their competencies by posting assessment results on Task Stream. Candidate evaluations of supervisors and clinical experiences and fieldwork are used in program planning.

3c. Candidates' Development & Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, & Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Initial Teacher Preparation		**X**	
3c. Candidates' Development & Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, & Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Advanced Preparation		**X**	

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation
Candidates in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs participate in numerous learning opportunities – including assessments - that are linked to the conceptual framework, state standards, coursework and fieldwork experiences. The results of their learning can be linked to the level of their students' achievement. Assessments conducted by the candidates themselves, field supervisors, and successful completion of TPAs are evidence that can been seen on Blackboard and Task Stream to demonstrate their success in making a positive difference in the lives of students from diverse experiences and backgrounds.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals
Candidates in Advanced Programs are admitted to programs meeting prerequisite entry

requirements which may include holding a prerequisite credential, completion of applications and admission interviews, prior teaching experience and a GPA of 3.0. As a result, they demonstrate the knowledge skills and professional dispositions necessary to help students from different backgrounds, ethnic groups and languages learn and succeed. They have also have had time for personal reflection and professional feedback from peers and faculty to know where they are going and to demonstrate proficiencies linked to the conceptual framework and standards.

Overall Assessment of the Standard

Field experiences and clinical practices occur throughout all credential programs. They provide the ability for candidates to apply practical application of knowledge, skills and dispositions into real settings. Exit surveys by candidates reflect that upon completion of their credential they feel "extremely" well prepared. An example of this has been demonstrated in West Contra Costa Unified School District, where they report an 80% retention rate for teachers with five years experience who were part of the CSUEB partnership with West Contra Costa.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

- AFIs corrected from last visit - None
- AFIs continued from last visit - None
- New AFIs - None

Recommendation for Standard 3 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met
Recommendation for Standard 3 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision: Met

Corrections to the Institutional Report: None

STANDARD 4. Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 4 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation and indicate the pages of the IR that are incorrect.)

<div align="center">X Yes   ☐ No</div>

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
4a. Design, Implementation, & Evaluation of Curriculum & Experiences – Initial Teacher Preparation		**X**	
4a. Design, Implementation, & Evaluation of Curriculum & Experiences – Advanced Preparation		**X**	

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation
The unit's conceptual framework, mission, and philosophy statements provide the foundation for four key learning outcomes related to equity and diversity that the unit clearly articulates, including:
- Knowledge, skills, and dispositions aligned with professional standards to implement universal design and research-based programs to achieve equitable learning outcomes.
- The ability to create environments, systems, and practices in which all individuals are treated with respect, dignity, trust, and fairness.
- The ability to work collaboratively within systems as change agents who promote democratic engagement and seek to create socially-just solutions.
- The ability to identify social injustices and the courage and commitment to engage in action and advocacy to redress them.

Each ITP program has a distinct plan for candidates to accomplish these outcomes and assesses their achievement at key points. In addition, course syllabi and the Summative Field Experience Evaluations (administered quarterly) reflect TPEs and program outcomes that are directly related to these outcomes, including a well-grounded framework for understanding and planning for diverse learners (including English learners and students with exceptionalities, varying learning styles) and demonstrating sensitivity and responsiveness to cultural and gender differences.

Across ITPs, candidates participate in a variety of courses and field experiences that prepare them to apply their knowledge, skills and dispositions towards helping all students achieve equitable learning outcomes; creating learning communities based upon respect, dignity, trust, and fairness; promoting democratic engagement and seeking socially just solutions; and identifying

and redressing social injustices. The unit provided an alignment chart delineating the signature assignments that assess the degree to which each outcome has been achieved. Further, specific coursework in serving special populations, enacting equity and valuing and responding equitably to diversity, teaching English learners, and adapting instruction and services in a responsive manner provide the foundation for candidates to connect instruction to students' experiences and cultures. Ongoing quarterly Summative Evaluations of Summative Field provide evidence of these skills as well as candidate's ability to communicate with students and families in sensitive ways and create learning communities within their classrooms and schools that value diversity.

A chart entitled "Unit Diversity Outcomes by Program, Assessment and Course Number" details the specific signature assignments, TPAs, and other evaluations used to provide candidates ongoing feedback about their performance in relation to the unit outcomes related to equity and diversity. In particular, the following assessment data were reported:

- MS candidates demonstrated high levels of diversity-related proficiencies on 3 signature assignments including the Mathematics Extended Lesson Plan which requires them to demonstrate and use their understandings of diverse learners and their needs to differentiate instruction (average scores of 3.74); the Case Study of a Struggling Reader which requires differentiation based upon assessment of a students' abilities and needs (mean score of 3.83); and the English Learner Lesson Plan which requires an understanding of linguistic development and application of appropriate strategies to support English learners' success in meeting specific outcomes (mea score of 3.83).
- SS candidates demonstrated adequate levels of diversity-related proficiencies on the Case Study of a Struggling Reader (mean score of 3.62); and the English Learner Lesson Plan (mean score of 3.77).
- MMSI candidates submit a standards-based portfolio and assignments that are assessed on program standards related to educating diverse learners; managing learning environment; effective communication and collaborative relationships; respect for personal, family, cultural, and community values; and adaptability. On each standard, mean scores ranged in the acceptable through exemplary range.
- MSDSI candidates complete two signature assignments that focus on instructional differentiation based upon linguistic, cultural, and specific learning differences. Mean scores on the Inclusive Services Evaluation and Collaborative Consultative Process report ranged from 3.87 to 3.94, indicating high levels of competence.
- MS and SS candidates demonstrate their competence on diversity standards through their completion of TPA 2: Designing Instruction, which requires that they apply their knowledge of cultural and linguistic differences and modifications for students with special needs to the development, assessment, and differentiation of learning experiences for diverse learners in their classrooms. 80% of the candidates who completed TPA 2 in 2008 met or exceeded minimal knowledge and skill requirements on this task.

In addition, ongoing Summative Field Experience Evaluations of all ITP candidates include measures of candidates' abilities to effectively teach English learners, apply cultural and individual knowledge of their students to creating engaging lessons, creating equitable and positive learning environments, and promoting equity and fairness. Scores on these particular outcomes across programs are within the skilled to mastery levels.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School

Professionals
All programs include a specific course related to diversity, designed to help candidates view the world through the eyes of people from different backgrounds. Faculty utilize fieldwork assignments to help candidates connect assessment, instruction, and, if necessary, to re-teach experiences to students' strengths and experiences. Faculty use fieldwork to provide regular feedback to candidates. Candidates develop reflection papers frequently throughout coursework and fieldwork that allow faculty the opportunity to assess candidate progress on developing diversity-related attitudes and skills. Throughout their programs, initial and advanced candidates complete various required assignments related to diversity. Candidates effectively design and teach lessons that meet the needs of diverse students, adapt and connect instruction appropriately, and create positive learning environments for all students.

Faculty for the advanced programs report that all coursework includes a diversity strand. The leadership programs, for example, focus on social justice and on developing "bold socially responsible leadership." Fieldwork requires advanced candidates to develop skills in diverse and varied settings that value diversity.

4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation
Although different faculty members teach in advanced and initial programs, data on diversity of the faculty are not disaggregated for individual programs within departments, and not all programs within the departments are part of the unit. In general the faculty members in the unit are diverse. Sixty-three percent of the faculty is White, which closely mirrors the institution's faculty percentage of 62% White. Other ethnic groups are also very similar to the overall ethnic breakdown of faculty within the university. The Asian/Pacific Islanders comprise 13.4% in the unit and 15% in the university. The percentage of Black, non-Hispanic faculty is 6.5% in the unit and 7.4% in the university. Hispanics represent 8% of the unit and 6.5% in the university. Other groups represent 8.6% of the unit and 8.6% in the university. The gender distribution for the unit is 69.4% female and 30.6% male, which diverges from the university gender distribution for the university which is 54% female and 45.5% male.

The university has developed policies to address diversity in recruitment of tenure track faculty which require that faculty search committees meet with the Diversity and Equity Liaison Officer. In addition to the Tenure Track Search Process Guidelines, the university developed a Faculty Recruitment Plan for Full Time Annual Lecturers. These efforts are directed toward attracting a diverse pool of applicants. In addition to nationwide advertisement, intensive in-state advertisement takes place to increase the diversity of the applicant pool.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals
Although different faculty members teach in advanced and initial programs, data on diversity of the faculty are not disaggregated for individual programs within departments, and not all programs within the departments are part of the unit. In general the faculty members in the unit are diverse. Sixty-three percent of the faculty is White, which closely mirrors the institution's

faculty percentage of 62% White. Other ethnic groups are also very similar to the overall ethnic breakdown of faculty within the university. The Asian/Pacific Islanders comprise 13.4% in the unit and 15% in the university. The percentage of Black, non-Hispanic faculty is 6.5% in the unit and 7.4% in the university. Hispanics represent 8% of the unit and 6.5% in the university. Other groups represent 8.6% of the unit and 8.6% in the university. The gender distribution for the unit is 69.4% female and 30.6% male, which diverges from the university gender distribution as for the university which is 54% female and 45.5% male.

The university has developed policies to address diversity in recruitment of tenure track faculty which require that faculty search committees meet with the Diversity and Equity Liaison Officer. In addition to the Tenure Track Search Process Guidelines, the university developed a Faculty Recruitment Plan for Full Time Annual Lecturers. These efforts are directed toward attracting a diverse pool of applicants. In addition to nationwide advertisement, intensive in-state advertisement takes place to increase the diversity of the applicant pool.

4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation
Candidates in initial programs in the unit are afforded the opportunity to interact with candidates from a variety of racial/ethnic groups. Data provided in the IR indicates that although candidates are not required to report race/ethnic background, approximately 80% of currently enrolled students have reported ethnicity. Of those, approximately 31.7% identify as being from racial/ethnic groups other than White. Female candidates outnumber male candidates, comprising 68.6% of the population. In the most recent draft of the unit's diversity goals, initiatives are planned to improve access to program information and to make the programs within the unit more welcoming to diverse populations. This will be measured by indications of greater student satisfaction, more diverse student applicant pools, and increased graduation and retention rates for African American, Latino and working class students. (Electronic Exhibit 4.a1). In an interview with the Associate Provost it was learned that this unit diversity plan is part of an overall university plan which is committed to maintaining and enhancing diversity at CSUEB. Diversity by program, cohort, and location was not available.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals
Information regarding experiences working with diverse candidates at the advanced level mirrors that of initial programs. For currently enrolled students, 76% self-identified racial/ethnic background. Of those, 31.3% identify as being from racial/ethnic groups other than White. As with the initial programs, in advanced programs female candidates outnumber male candidates, comprising 77.2% of the population.

4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students to P-12 Schools		X	
4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students			

to P-12 Schools – Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation

Field experiences and clinical practices occur throughout all credential programs. They provide the ability for candidates to apply practical application of knowledge, skills and dispositions into real settings. Exit surveys by candidates reflect that upon completion of their credential they feel "extremely" well prepared. An example of this has been demonstrated in West Contra Costa Unified School District, where they report an 80% retention rate for teachers with five years experience who were part of the CSUEB partnership with West Contra Costa.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals

Foundation, core and elective coursework offered in clinical and fieldwork requirements in each program in the unit ensure that candidates participate in at least one field/clinical experience with students or clients from diverse populations. However, the demographics of sites used for field experiences and clinical practice have high percentages (average 66%) of students from diverse ethnic groups so working with diverse students is a given. As a result, these opportunities provide candidates with many ways to reflect on issues of "social justice and democracy" to see how they can use their skills, knowledge and dispositions to ensure ALL students have equal opportunity to learn and succeed.

Overall Assessment of the Standard

The university and the unit pride themselves on the commitment that is evident across the campus. The unit has developed four key outcomes which have diversity embedded in each outcome. Program faculty is committed to social justice and democratic ideals. The curriculum at initial and advanced levels is clearly directed at ensuring that all candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to ensure that all students learn. Faculty and students are diverse. The CTC mandates diverse field placements at the initial level and advanced candidates work with diverse student or in diverse settings as they develop their professional expertise.

The unit is making intentional efforts to ensure that positive attention to diversity and equity are incorporated into every aspect of the programs and plans made in the unit. The concept of diversity is articulated in one of the three foundational areas of knowledge for the programs which says, "Honing a social justice lens, …..reflect on ways in which gender, class, race, ethnicity, language, sexual orientation and power relations affect educational environments."

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

- AFIs corrected from last visit - None
- AFIs continued from last visit - None
- New AFIs - None

Recommendation for Standard 4 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met
Recommendation for Standard 4 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision: Met

Corrections to the Institutional Report: None

STANDARD 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 5 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation and indicate the pages of the IR that are incorrect.)

X   Yes   ☐   No

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
5a. Qualified Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
5a. Qualified Faculty – Advanced Preparation		X	
Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation) The associate dean verified that as of Fall 2008 there were 42 tenure track (15 full professors 15 associate professors, 12 assistant professors) faculty members and 3 full-time temporary faculty/lecturers in the unit. All tenure-track and temporary faculty hold doctorates. Vitae indicate that all faculty members have expertise in their assigned areas as well as documented experiences in professional and clinical settings. There are also 115 part-time adjunct faculty members and fieldwork supervisors who either hold current licenses in the fields they supervise or have been licensed in the area previously. All faculty members, including lecturers and supervisors, have relevant and contemporary experience in the fields in which they teach as well as knowledge of content in their areas.			
5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Advanced Preparation		X	
Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation Assignments and assessments used by faculty engage the candidates in the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving and professional dispositions by using instructional strategies such as collaborative problem solving, case studies, and use of internet resources. Syllabi indicate that the faculty use varied resources within their classes to adapt instruction and provide models for candidates. Syllabi and interviews of candidates and faculty describe the integration of diversity and technology throughout the programs of professional study. Many of the faculty members have rich experience with diverse student populations and many have published in the area of diversity. Technology is incorporated into courses in a variety of ways including the use of presentation software and internet access during classroom instruction and assignments that require internet use for collection and analysis of data. Professors also use the electronic course management system for discussion board opportunities. Computer usage is required in all courses in the writing of lesson plans, papers and other written work submitted for evaluation. A unit faculty member received the University Professor of the Year award in 2008.			

		X	
5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation
CSUEB has clear personnel statements detailing the expectation for faculty scholarship. Faculty engage in a broad range of scholarly activity including systematic inquiry into areas related to their teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel. Faculty members have made these activities public through journals (refereed national as well as regional and state), books, grants, and presentations. Unit faculty members have, over the past two years, published 77 articles, books or book chapters. During the same period 34 faculty members made 133 presentations at state, national, and international conferences, and 8 members of the faculty received grants totaling more than1.6 million dollars. The scholarship and research activities reflect faculty engagement in the improvement of schools, teaching, and learning.

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation)
The Promotion, Tenure and Review Policy identifies internal university service and external representation as important aspects of tenured and tenure-track faculty assignments. The unit includes programs in multiple colleges and interaction and collaboration are encouraged and nurtured. Faculty members from both colleges serve on various CSUEB committees and work together on curricular changes, leadership, sharing ideas regarding the college, and proposal and grant writing.

Faculty members maintain contact with public schools in their multiple roles for at least of 30 hours every three years as mandated by the state. They are engaged in a variety of collaborative projects and experiences within school settings, including professional development programs, advisory committees, collaborative grants and program evaluation.
Faculty are also engaged in a wide range of service activities that include serving as editors and reviewers for professional journals, presidents and board members of national and state associations, and as members and chairs of a full range of department, college and university committees.

As part of the process of improving learning, faculty are engaged in partnerships with schools and agencies across the state going beyond traditional workshops, and maintaining a high level of collaboration with community colleges in the region. Collaborative activities with other colleges within the university, P-14 schools, and external institutions to promote an increase in the number of science and math teachers are extensive and support a statewide CSU initiative.

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation)
All faculty members, full- and part-time, are evaluated by the unit, and by the candidates in each course they teach. Procedures for evaluating faculty members and criteria for retention and promotion are explicitly stated in the CSUEB Promotion, Tenure and Retention Policy and Procedures and in the collective bargaining agreement between the California Faculty Association and the CSU.

Evaluation for tenured faculty is required at intervals of no more than five years. Probationary tenure track faculty members submit their documentation annually for six years. Tenure track faculty members are evaluated by elected faculty committees of tenured faculty at the department, college and university levels, in that order. Committee recommendations, together with the separate recommendations of department chairs and college deans, are forwarded to the university president, who reviews the documentation and recommendations from lower levels and makes the final decisions about retention, tenure, and promotion.

Candidate evaluation of faculty consists of course evaluations conducted in a manner to maintain the anonymity of candidates. The results of these course evaluations are given to the faculty member and become part of the review dossier. The dean and chairs also review the results of the course evaluations and discuss the results with faculty concerned. Lecturers and supervisors who teach three or more quarters are evaluated annually on instructional performance and currency in the field. Full-time temporary faculty members are also evaluated on internal university contributions as part of their work assignment.

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation
The university's Faculty Development Center offers an extensive array of development opportunities. The center offers mentoring and support to faculty new to the tenure track in the development of their dossiers. New and continuing faculty may participate in a formative classroom evaluation program. An annual fall retreat provides workshops in teaching and learning strategies and instructional technology. A year-long menu of workshops, seminars, and conversations promote teaching excellence. Faculty also initiate faculty learning community sessions which bring together small groups of faculty from across disciplines and colleges to discuss specific pedagogical topics. Unit faculty members have been active initiators of these sessions.

Within the unit, professional development in the past year has focused on the implementation of the California Teaching Performance Assessment and a new assessment data management system. In addition, a series of forums was initiated as an outgrowth of the fall retreat of the college in which the unit is situated. The forums focus on scholarship and research and are conversations designed to develop a culture of trust and collaboration among faculty. Faculty also participates extensively in professional organizations, and the university provides support for faculty invited to present or act in an official role at professional conferences and meetings.

Overall Assessment of the Standard
Faculty possess the qualifications and experience required to implement an effective teacher preparation program. The experiences and expertise of the faculty, supervisors and adjuncts provide a good balance between educational theory and practice. The experience, research, and professional activity of the faculty in supporting teaching and learning for diverse student populations serves California's P-14 students and schools well.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:

- AFIs corrected from last visit - None
- AFIs continued from last visit - None
- New AFIs - None

Recommendation for Standard 5 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met
Recommendation for Standard 5 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision: Met

Corrections to the Institutional Report: None

STANDARD 6: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 6 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation and indicate the pages of the IR that are incorrect.)

X   Yes   ☐   No

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
6a. Unit Leadership & Authority – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
6a. Unit Leadership & Authority – Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation)
The College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS) is the official professional unit for educator preparation programs at California State University, East Bay. The unit is headed by an interim dean, interim associate dean, and the Council of Chairs. Because there are programs within the College that are not educator preparation, and because one preparation program exists outside of the College (Language, Speech and Hearing in CLASS), the unit also makes use of a University Council on Teacher Education (COTE). According to documentation, the purpose of this advisory group is to provide opportunities for faculty and staff stakeholders across colleges and departments at CSUEB to discuss issues that relate to teacher preparation programs. The membership includes representatives from CEAS, CLASS, the Career Development Center, Enrollment Management, College of Science, and Continuing Education. This council meets twice a year.

The governance structure in CEAS is very much a work in progress. A clearly defined Bylaws document delineates the roles and responsibilities of the dean, associate dean and various governance structures. However, this document is currently under review and many of the existing committees have been tabled. The unit has also experienced many leadership changes in the past three years. There have been three failed dean searches, two individuals serving as interim dean, and three individuals serving as interim associate dean. According to the Provost the plan for next year is to appoint another interim dean for a two-year period. While the individuals serving in interim positions have done an admirable job and garnered faculty support, the lack of a permanent dean has caused morale problems and uncertainty among the faculty and staff. This uncertainty, which surfaced during interviews, has complicated the unit's momentum to maintain and sustain a fully functioning and effective governance structure. This is further evidenced by the tabling of several existing committees and the limited data related to a comprehensive, integrated unit level assessment system.

The unit's recruiting, admissions, grading and advising policies and procedures are clearly described in print and electronic publications. The Credential Student Service Center provides

coordination of all departmental information, and as stated in their mission, and verified through interviews, "provides accurate and responsive credential information to students and the education community through personalized and efficient services." Additionally, students have a wealth of support services provided to them at both the college and university level. This includes advising, career development, disability student services, and counseling services.

The unit ensures participation of P-12 faculty in program design, implementation and evaluation. This is accomplished through the use of departmental/program advisory boards. Most notable is the current joint collaborations in STEM initiatives to increase the number of science and math teachers. An interview with the Provost revealed that CSUEB produces more math and science teachers than any other CSU campuses. These collaborations also include faculty in the College of Science, county education offices, and community college partners.

6b. Unit Budget – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
6b. Unit Budget – Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation)
The CEAS base budget for 2008-2009 was $7,090,084 with an additional $280,000 in one time funding and $117,000 for enrollment adjustments. The total allocation was $7,487,584. College budgets are determined based on generated full-time equivalent students (FTEs) plus mandatory expenses. Deans are given the authority to determine how funds are allocated to departments. However, 90% of the expenses of the colleges are tied to salaries which are negotiated between the CSU and the California Faculty Association. Because of the use of funding formulas, CEAS receives an equitable budget allocation in relationship to other colleges in the university and has sufficient resources for the preparation of candidates. of intercollegiate athletics from CEAS to a separate budget.

The State of California is experiencing budget difficulties. As a result, the allocation to the University has decreased and the operating budget has declined from $148,000,000 to $142,000,000 (state funding plus student fees). The University is expecting additional cuts for FY10. According to the Associate Vice President for Academic Resources, the decision has been made to limit the effect on academic programs. The current budget model for 2009-2010 proposes a 4-5% cut to academic units, and a 16-20% cut for non-academic units. The result in CEAS will be the elimination or combining of low-enrolled courses, fewer cohorts, increases in minimum class size, limits to faculty travel (especially out-of-state), and limits in professional development opportunities that will now be geared to faculty in the tenure track. Even given these considerations, the unit will not lose tenure track faculty and will be able to provide essential course and clinical experiences for its students.

6c. Personnel – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
6c. Personnel – Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation)
Workload policies for all faculty are negotiated through the CSU and California Faculty Association. The current agreement defines the workload as 15 weighted teaching units (WTU) per quarter, 12 of which are for teaching and 3 units for instructionally related activities (advising, scholarship, service). Lecturers teach 15 WTU per quarter. Faculty teaching at the graduate level have reduced SFR (student faculty ratio) and small seminar classes, as well as individual responsibility for supervision of fieldwork and research. The unit does not use teaching assistants. According to interviews with the current and former budget analysts for the college, there is a significant allocation of assigned time for program coordination and other duties. The majority of faculty in CEAS are below the 12 WTU standard. Faculty may not exceed a

supervision load of 18 candidates unless there is a unique circumstance. The IR reports that in Fall 2008, there were only two such instances, and in both cases the supervisors had extremely high candidate evaluations. In all instances, faculty loads are monitored to ensure that they do not exceed the negotiated agreement. Interviews yielded no concerns related to workload issues.

There are sufficient support personnel in the unit to meet the needs of candidates and programs. They include departmental administrative assistants, credential analysts, budget analysts, and IT analysts. Further, the university provides four technology specialists and a library liaison. The support staff in CEAS meet quarterly to resolve issues that cross programs and to enhance the flow of communication. Support staff are also members of a bargaining unit that provides oversight of conditions of employment including workload issues. During the interview, staff indicated that they have sufficient resources to accomplish their assigned tasks and appreciate working in a very supportive, collaborative environment.

The unit provides limited professional development opportunities due to recent budget declines. However, faculty have a wealth of in-house professional development opportunities through the university. These include technology training, access to a Faculty Development Center which sponsors learning communities, workshops and a voluntary mentoring program, and support in grant-writing through the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects. Tenured faculty have access to sabbatical leaves, and in 2008, newly-hired tenure track faculty received a one-course release to focus on scholarship.

6d. Unit Facilities – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
6d. Unit Facilities – Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation)
CEAS is administratively housed in the Art and Education Building, an older facility that is shared with the Art Department. The building has been renovated so that classrooms have enhanced technology including LCD projectors and screens, networked computers, sound systems, and DVD/VCR units. Faculty office space is shared in most cases, and although this may impede opportunities to meet privately with students, interviews revealed that care is taken to assign faculty who have dissimilar schedules. Office space for part-time faculty is also shared and limited. Classrooms are centrally assigned, so students and faculty may have classes in a variety of locations. The Department of Communicative Sciences and Disorders is housed in the Music Building, which is a newer facility. Candidates in that program have access to a fully equipped Hearing Clinic on-site.

The University Library is recently refurbished and prides itself on its user-friendly quality. The library supports student and faculty research and provides instruction in information literacy. The academic collection includes online and print resources, and also includes a section of children's books. The Library houses a learning commons with over 100 computer stations, tutoring, laptop loaners, and services for patrons with disabilities. The library is open over 80 hours per week and offers online chat assistance 24/7. It also has inter-library loan capabilities and participates in several consortial arrangements that give users maximum access to a variety of materials. Most recently, through funding from the Department of Educational Leadership, the library is enhancing the collection to accommodate the new doctoral program. The education library liaison is also collaborating on a social networking software package (DIVA) to assist graduate students in CEAS in sharing research findings.

CSUEB also has a branch campus in Concord. A site visit to that campus revealed that facilities are sufficient and appropriate to support candidates in educator preparation programs at all levels. The President's vision, "One University, Many Campuses," ensures that the Concord campus has all the basic services of the main campus in Hayward. Candidates taking courses at the Concord campus have access to instructional technology, a library, and student support services such as campus security, counseling and health services. Classrooms are technology enhanced and there are two distance learning classrooms.

6e. Unit Resources including Technology – Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
6e. Unit Resources including Technology – Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation)
The college dean allocates resources to the departments in CEAS to adequately prepare candidates. According to the budget analyst, this is done predominately on the basis of full-time faculty and FTEs. A review of the budgets for three of the departments reveals relatively consistent allocations over a three-year period.

As mentioned in 6d above, the classrooms in the Art and Education Building are technology enhanced and there are two computer labs and one multimedia room housed in the building. There are 163 TEC classrooms across the campus. The unit is supported by Information Technology Services which provides technical, network, software, and training support. In addition, ITS has a special division which provides support for online courses. The library, in addition to teaching and learning support, selects materials for the collection based on input and requests from each of the departments in CEAS. Faculty computers are replaced on a three to four year cycle and faculty also have access to Blackboard course management software for all of their courses.

Most programs in the unit use TaskStream to collect and store candidate assessment data. External consultants were hired to assist the unit in developing and implementing assessment across the programs. Additionally an assessment coordinator was funded for the unit. In FY09, the Office of the Provost provided one time funding to the unit for accreditation ($179,000) and for the implementation of Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA, $22,500).

CEAS faculty were successful in securing grant funding in the amount of $723,883 in 2008. Faculty were co-investigators on grants totaling another $885,416.00. One of these was with a faculty member in the College of Science. The majority of these funded efforts support the college and university's STEM efforts.

Overall Assessment of the Standard
The College of Education and Allied Studies has the authority, budget, personnel and facilities to prepare candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. Inability to secure key unit leadership positions (dean and associate dean) have led to a lessening of morale and uncertainty on the part of faculty and staff. The unit currently has resources to effectively support candidates. However, anticipated budget cuts may lead to a decrease in funding for next year. Central administration has indicated that academic units will remain a priority. Technology resources are sufficient to support candidate and faculty needs. The unit's collaborative efforts

in the area of STEM initiatives have brought increased funding to support noteworthy programs to increase science and math teachers for the state.

Summary of Strengths: Faculty in the unit have successfully secured funding for several STEM initiatives that support collaborations from P-12 through higher education. The unit is considered a leader in the numbers of science and math teachers it produces.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales:
- **AFIs corrected from last visit** - The unit does not have the authority to manage or coordinate the Clinical/Rehabilitative Service/Speech, Language, and Hearing program.

  The deans of the College of Education and Allied Studies and the College of Letters and Social Sciences coordinate the management of the Language, Speech and Hearing program. Oversight of credentialing is now handled by the Credential Student Services Center in CEAS, and faculty from both CEAS and CLASS serve on the University Council for Teacher Education.

- **AFIs continued from last visit** – None

- **New AFIs –**
  Due to a lack of stability in unit leadership, the unit has not maintained a governance and structure for evaluating programs and unit operations at the unit level.
  Rationale:
  The unit has had three failed dean searches, two interim deans, and three interim associate deans. The plan for next academic year is to appoint another interim dean for a two year period. Absence of permanent leadership has caused uncertainty and hampered efforts to develop an integrated assessment system at the unit level.

Recommendation for Standard 6 Initial Teacher Preparation: Met
Recommendation for Standard 6 Advanced Preparation: Met

State Team Decision: Met with concerns
  Rationale: The institution has not maintained a leadership structure for evaluating programs and operations at the unit level. Evidence from documents and interviews indicates that the continued dependence upon interim leadership at the unit level has interfered with efforts to develop an integrated unit assessment system and to build unit identity.

Corrections to the Institutional Report: None

CTC Common Standards Not Covered by NCATE Unit Standards

CTC Common Standard 1.1

Met

Findings:

The Education Unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.
Through interviews with the credential analysts and review of the credential requirement checklists for each program, evidence shows the unit has a credential recommendation process in place. Checkpoints along the way ensure all candidates are informed and on track to meet requirements as they proceed through the credential process. Analysts are competent and available for candidates and faculty. Candidate status reports are provided to candidates and unit faculty and administrators each quarter.

CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance
Met
Findings:

6.1: Qualified members of the Unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist in their professional placement.
Enrollment advisors for the university and the program are trained in best practices for student service. It is their responsibility to make contact with interested potential students, provide both paper and web materials, and make contact as needed. The Director for the Credential Student Service Center is relatively new to the positive and has been reorganizing the center to improve services to candidates and data to the unit.

6.2 Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements.
Each candidate is provided with a handbook to guide them through the credential process. There is an initial orientation as they begin the program and ongoing checkpoints to ensure that they meet requirements. Faculty in the various programs, credential analysts and advisors and counselors in the Career Center are available to answer questions and to provide guidance. As candidates near the completion of their credential, the Career Center, in conjunction with the Credential Student Service Center, provides opportunities for mock interviews as well as job fairs with local education agencies.

6.3 The Unit provides support to candidates who need special assistance, and retains in each program only those candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.
Academic, dispositional mentoring and coaching are offered for individuals who require support to successfully complete credential requirements. The Student Disability Resource Center (SDRC) provides ongoing assistance for those with disabilities as do advisors in the Career Center. There is also the EXCEL tutorial center available for undergraduates and writing support for graduates entering advanced program candidates. The careful monitoring of their progress and achievement as candidates progress through their programs ensures their suitability for program retention and advancement in the education profession.

Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject with Internship
Multiple Subject with BCLAD

Findings on Standards:
CSU East Bay's Multiple Subject program is offered in Contra Costa, Concord, and Hayward through several delivery options including traditional fifth year, interns, blended and hybrid on-line based models. The program offers 9 multiple subject cohorts annually with approximately 250 students. Each cohort has between 12 and 35 students.

Social justice, equity, and leadership are woven through the multiple subject program at CSU East Bay through theory and practice. From interviews with principals from several partner schools, the data collected indicated that candidates understand the relationship between philosophy and pedagogical practice that reflect these values. Candidates are actively engaged in dialogue about equity, diversity, and fairness through both course and fieldwork in a coherent system. Alumni and present candidates say that they are consistently challenged to consider how best to meet the needs of California's diverse learners.

CSU East Bay has close, long-time partnerships with Contra Costa, New Haven, and Concord School Districts. These partnerships allow for strong cohesion between the field experience and coursework. Evidence for this was found in interviews with district human resources personnel, principals, field based team leaders and program documents.

Candidates complete three quarters of field experience. A team leader who has a continuous relationship with the cohort throughout the year facilitates each cohort seminar. The team leader is the liaison between the candidates, university supervisors, and the school district. The team leader provides coordination, monitors candidates' progress, offers academic advisement, and is a counselor to the candidates. Candidates complete 75 quarter units in a calendar year program. BCLAD candidates complete 2 additional courses and demonstrate capacity to teach in the second language as well as work with the cultural and linguistic diversity of the community. Evidence from interviews with team leaders and principals corroborated these findings.

There are two entry points to the program. The program includes a purposeful sequence of specific courses. Candidates begin the program with a set of foundational courses. Field experience begins in the second quarter. The cohort model promotes collegial support from peers and team faculty. Collegial support was evident in candidates' and graduates' unsolicited remarks as well as team leaders' descriptions of their expectations. Coursework and field experiences utilize a variety of strategies for professional instruction and provide multiple opportunities for candidates to learn and practice the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE). BTSA support providers corroborated this finding, as did program documents and course syllabi.

The coursework and fieldwork are structured to provide a developmental sequence. The sequence complements and supports reflective practice related to the TPEs and the philosophical values of diversity, equity and advocacy. Evidence of extensive reflection was found in candidate journals and coursework. A strength of the program is the development of practical theory.

Three courses of reading instruction provides substantive, research-based instruction that effectively prepares each candidate to teach reading/language arts. Each candidate is prepared to

deliver a comprehensive program of systematic instruction. The same faculty member teaches the these three courses and prepares students to complete the RICA. All candidates have multiple systematic opportunities to acquire the knowledge, skills and abilities to deliver comprehensive instruction to English learners (EL). Evidence of capacity to differentiate for English learners and students with special needs was found in interviews with principals, BTSA providers and student work. Candidates apply TPEs to the teaching of each major subject area, and they learn and use specific pedagogical knowledge and skills that comprise the subject-specific TPEs for Multiple Subject Candidates.

All candidates experience a full school year of field experience which includes two placements, K-2 and 3-5 with at least five students of English learners. BCLAD candidates are placed with qualified master teachers. When an intern is the teacher of record, each intern observes and participates in the instruction of students in settings and grade levels different than the regular assignment. Candidates have extensive opportunities to observe, acquire and utilize important pedagogical knowledge, skills and abilities. Interviews report that long standing partnerships with local school districts, county offices, and cooperating administrators provide opportunities for each candidate to work with exemplary certificated teachers in fieldwork assignments, including placements in diverse settings. A review of summative evaluations and interviews with candidates and graduates document that university supervisors provide regular feedback in consultation with the master teacher linked to the TPEs.

The university supervisors and master teachers assess candidate competence on the 13 TPEs at a summative 3 way conference at the end of each placement. Candidates complete and pass the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) with a score of 3 or 4.

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Single Subject Credential
Single Subject Internship Credential

Findings on Standards:
The Single Subject Credential Program at CSU East Bay prepares candidates for the Preliminary Single Subject Credential. The program operates within the College of Education and Allied Studies and embraces their commitment to prepare collaborative leaders who represent professional excellence, social justice and democracy, and who will influence a diverse and interconnected world. With the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) as the foundation and theory and practice as the brick and mortar, this goal is attainable for their candidates.

The program has a four-quarter cohort system that covers 21 courses totaling 73 quarter units. Candidates typically start in the summer, taking courses that prepare them to enter the placement classroom in the fall. Psychological foundations, content literacy, health and safety, classroom environment and instructional methods are all part of the longer summer session. During the entire year's sequence, candidates continue to take instructional methods courses in order to provide extensive opportunities to analyze, implement, and reflect on the relationship between theory and practice related to teaching and learning. Starting with the fall quarter, the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) is embedded into the program as key assessments

which allow the candidates opportunities to focus on the principles of educational equity, diversity, and their implementation in curriculum content and school practices for all students.

Teacher Performance Expectations are the foundation of this program. With content experts leading the instructional methods courses and field experience coordinated closely with these courses, candidates are given multiple opportunities to learn, practice and reflect upon the TPEs as well as make pedagogical connections specifically for their content area of study. Providing access to the core curriculum for all students is a major theme and the candidates are continuously challenged to determine how that relates to their credential area while maintaining developmentally appropriate practices. Candidates not only learn to plan and deliver instruction to students with special needs, but to English learners. Candidates take a course that prepares them to provide instruction in content-based reading and writing skills for all students. Computer based technology is also offered with the idea that it can facilitate the teaching and learning process.

Fieldwork, which is seen as a strength in this program, takes place over the three traditional quarters in the form of student teaching or as an internship. Candidates are placed in two different settings. Interns must complete an alternate school experience of no less than 25 hours. Formal observations are completed at least eight times, and as the school year progresses so do the student teacher's responsibilities in the classroom. Strong relationships exist with surrounding districts. Master teachers and/or support providers are chosen by the site principals and verified by the institutions placement coordinators.

A candidate's performance is evaluated through formative and summative assessments. Classroom activities and signature assignments are an integral part of the coursework. Fieldwork evaluations are formal narratives that concentrate on strengths coupled with a summative evaluation at the end of each placement based upon the TPEs. Each candidate completes a comprehensive portfolio which is loaded on Task Stream by the student. The TPA tasks are the formal summative assessments for the program and students take a one unit course for each task in order to facilitate the process.

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Education Specialist Credential
Mild/Moderate Disabilities Level I with Internship
Mild/Moderate Disabilities Level II with Internship

Findings on Standards:
The Education Specialist Credential Program in Mild/Moderate Disabilities at California State University, East Bay prepares educators who will advocate for and provide leadership in local districts' efforts to provide effective instruction in the inclusive schooling context. The Level I program has three pathways for earning the Preliminary credential: TED/SPED, a six quarter combined multiple subjects/ educational specialist credentials program; SPED only, a six-quarter program for candidates who already hold a Multiple Subjects or Single Subject credential, and the Intern program, for TED/SPED candidates who take a position as the teacher of record in a special education program while completing credential coursework requirements. Candidates in the Level II program complete common courses and a choice of electives while teaching.

The program uses a performance-based, field-oriented approach based on a philosophy that the education of all youth is the shared responsibility of general education teachers, special educators, parents, administrators, and related personnel. Two full-time faculty, one professor emerita, and one part-time faculty member teach in the program. One of the full-time faculty members serves as program coordinator. The program is cohesively designed and effectively coordinated. Two community advisory committees, one for the Intern program and one for the special education program as a whole, meet regularly with program faculty and report that their feedback is incorporated into program improvement and development.

Graduates and employers report that the dual credential program gives candidates a unique and comprehensive ability to learn both general education curricula and special education and to teach students with diverse needs. Candidates learn about the ethical, legal, and historical bases of special education. Current candidates, graduates, and employers all identified that the emphasis on connecting coursework to fieldwork as particularly strong.

Candidates in the TED/SPED program complete two quarters of general education field placements/student teaching, followed by one quarter of special education student teaching. Most of the candidates then become interns in the second year of the program. Interviews showed that field supervisors and master teachers are experienced, responsive, and helpful. Communication and collaboration with district and school personnel was consistently reported to be strong. Employers reported that they are eager to hire graduates of the program, and are eager to place more student teachers from the program in their schools.

The program has a system for determining that candidates have satisfied each professional competence in coursework and fieldwork through a sequence of assessments and a culminating portfolio in both Level I and Level II. Candidate competence is determined by a performance on combination of signature assignments throughout the coursework, fieldwork evaluations by both master teachers and university supervisors, and the standards-based portfolio.

Based on a review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Education Specialist Credential
Moderate Severe Disabilities, Level I with Internship
Moderate Severe Disabilities, Level II with Internship

Findings on Standards:
The Education Specialist Credential Program in Moderate Severe Disabilities at CSU East Bay is built on the foundational philosophy that graduates will be both advocates for students and their families and leaders within effective, diverse schools that educate all students, including those with disabilities. From a knowledge base of historical and current research in instructional strategies and design, curriculum, human development, and legal issues, the program seeks to develop students committed to effective, inclusive teaching. Candidates can participate in the program at Level 1, Level 2, and as an intern.

The focus of the Moderate Severe disabilities credential program is the development of instructional, curricular, interpersonal, and management skills to enhance both teacher effectiveness and student learning during elementary and secondary school. The program infuses experiences of academic study, direct work with students, and partnerships with the community and families. Parents report that candidates from the program are knowledgeable of and sensitive to their needs regarding understanding their child's disability and connecting with available resources and support systems both inside and outside of the school setting. Employers and master teachers shared that candidates are well prepared with instructional skills and strategies, have a high degree of motivation, are willing to participate in all the various aspects of the school community, and are resilient advocates for the unique needs of their students. The Level 1 credential is a collaboration between general education and special education whereby candidates earn dual credentials in Multiple Subject and Education Specialist–Moderate/Severe. Candidates have found that such a program, although quite rigorous, uniquely prepares them for working with students with moderate to severe disabilities within the context of the general education classroom. Employers feel that this type of dual-credentialing program supplies them with candidates who are highly qualified for the workplace. The sequence of coursework and field experiences are logically arranged to give candidates the maximum opportunity to demonstrate the program standards. The Level 2 program for the Moderate/Severe credential is an in-depth extension of the Level 1 program coordinated around the candidate's own induction plan.

The field experience for Level 1 consists of two quarters of general education supervised fieldwork (90 clock hours) and then two quarters of special education supervised fieldwork (90 clock hours). The candidates then student teach full time for one entire quarter. Interns work at their job site for 80% of the time with the remaining time spent in different placements to ensure experiences with diverse types of disabilities within the moderate/severe category. Master teachers are carefully selected and are supported by university supervisors who train and meet with them at least weekly for feedback and discussion. District administrative staff expressed confidence in the candidates and in the level of support that they received from the university at both the faculty and the supervisory levels.

Candidate competency is assessed formatively in both Level 1 and Level 2 through a series of signature assignments with corresponding rubrics. At the end of both levels, candidates are thoroughly assessed with instruments directly tied to program standards. Both checklists and narrative forms are used by their instructors, master teachers, and university fieldwork supervisors to provide feedback on candidate competence.

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Clear Teaching Credential Program

Findings on Standards:
The mission of the CSU East Bay Multiple and Single Subject Clear Credential Program is to prepare collaborative leaders committed to professional excellence, social justice, and democracy who will influence a diverse and interconnected world. The foundation of this program is to extend and advance candidate knowledge and skills acquired during the preliminary credential.

The CSU East Bay Clear Credential Program has primarily served private school teachers who verify that their school or district has no induction program. There were 25 candidates enrolled in summer 2008 and 18 enrolled in fall 2008. CSU East Bay did not admit any Clear Program students from January to May 2009.

The program consists solely of the four advanced study courses: Advanced Special Education, Advanced Study of Teaching Special Populations, Advanced Study of Using Technology to Support Student Learning, and Advanced Study of Teaching English Learners. Candidates can enroll in a single course and take the four courses over time. Candidates can enter the program at any point and do not belong to a cohort.

Candidates completing the four advanced courses are recommended for the Clear Credential.

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Reading Certificate and the
Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential Program

Findings on Standards:
The Reading Certificate and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Programs at California State University, East Bay (CSUEB) were developed to be in alignment with the mission and theme of the Department of the Teacher Education and School of Allied Studies. (CEAS). The development of this alignment is noted in the program document. The mission of the Department of Teacher Education is "To prepare teachers who are dedicated to the academic achievement of all students, and who demonstrate a commitment to lifelong, professional growth and school leadership." A review of course syllabi and interviews with faculty confirmed an alignment with the theme and mission statement.

The programs are designed to prepare educators to (1) occupy leadership roles in their schools and school districts and (2) present curriculum, implement instructional strategies, and utilize assessment plans that promote social justice and democracy. Candidates in the programs develop

a keen sense of the key issues and benchmarks of literacy development in all grade levels. There is a close link between coursework and field experiences. Currently, this is a small program with 50 students enrolled in the program.

CUSEB offers a three-tiered program in Reading that includes a Reading Certificate Program, a Reading and Language Arts Credential Program, and an optional Master of Science with an Option in Reading Instruction. A prerequisite for the program is a valid teaching credential. Candidates may choose to complete the certificate program as part of a MS degree in Education.

The programs are designed to build upon each other. The Reading Certificate program requires 23 quarter units of graduate Reading coursework, including research and practice on Developing Fluent Readers (TED 6230), Assessment (TED 6231), and Field Experience (TED 6251). The Specialist Credential requires 22 quarter units beyond the Certificate. This program includes Advanced Clinical Experiences (TED 6233) and opportunities to develop and practice leadership skills in Reading/Language Arts Leadership and Professional Development (TED 6252). Clinical candidates participate in an intensive clinical experience during the Clinical Seminar (TED 6234).

Field experiences are an important part of the programs and are embedded in the courses. A review of the syllabi, interviews with candidates, instructors and graduates of the program attest to the depth and variety of field experiences. These experiences are designed to give candidates experience working with students with different ethnic, cultural, linguistic and socio-economic backgrounds. In addition to the embedded field experiences, candidates in the certificate program complete a course, Reading/Language Arts Field Experience (TED 6251) that requires the candidate to describe and critique an exemplary school's Reading and Language Arts instructional program. Candidates in the credential program are required to complete a clinical experience that includes the assessment, diagnosis, instruction, and evaluation of a student's reading performance (TED 6234).

Candidates are assessed in multiple ways throughout the coursework. Currently, candidates complete signature assignments that are uploaded to the Task Stream platform. Faculty routinely reviews the data in efforts to improve the program. Several of the signature assignments are used as part of the more formal program assessment system at the initial, midpoint, and end of the program. Candidates reported that the theory, research, practice, and assessment components of the program were integrated and assessed in the Clinical Seminar (TED 6234) and Advanced Study in Early Literacy (TED 6254).

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential
Preliminary Administrative Services Credential with Internship Option

Program Design, Philosophy and Rationale

At CSU East Bay, the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) is part of the Department of Educational Leadership. The program mission is to prepare "Bold, Socially Responsible Leaders".

The six quarter, 24 credit program, which contains three quarters of field experience, may also be completed in three quarters. A unique feature of the program design is that the cohort has the same professor for the first three courses, which are tied to field experiences. This model capitalizes on the strengths of the cohort, the coherence of curriculum, mentoring and continuity, and connection of theory to practice. The remaining three non-cohort courses may be taken during or after the cohort courses, and are taught by various highly qualified faculty. Candidates using the internship option take the same courses as non-interns. The intern program has an additional orientation course and regular seminars.

The philosophy of preparation of "Bold, Socially Responsible Leaders" (BSRL), is reflected in the program expectations, course content, assignments, activities and assessments. The CSU East Bay Education Leadership outcomes, called Mindscapes, are aligned with the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs) and CTC program standards. The five Mindscapes are candidate performance outcomes that identify the skills and attributes of an effective leader that are tied to expected impacts in schools.

The graduates and practicing administrators reported that the program was of high quality and prepared candidates ready to perform as administrators who would succeed and make a positive impact on schools, communities and student achievement.

The curriculum is designed to build leadership skills through the knowledge of the CPSELs and application of that knowledge in coursework. The Mindscapes are covered in every course and the specific CPSELs can be found in coursework. The first course addresses vision; the second addresses instruction, professional development, and student achievement; the third addresses organizational management; and in three non-cohort courses address law, finance, and politics. Diversity, community involvement, collaboration, ethics and capacity for leadership are taught throughout the program.

A significant strength of the program is the commitment to diversity and equity as well as preparation of their candidates to be advocates for success for all students. Diversity and equity are emphasized throughout all coursework and field experiences. One project which has received praise by area administrators and candidates is the Equity Plan in which candidates analyze personal beliefs and biases, analyze achievement data for sub groups at their school site, and create a proposal for change. Candidates experience building collaborative communities through their field experiences. Candidates and graduates cited the Equity Plan activity as effectively impacting their ability to affect change in their schools.

Field experiences are connected to coursework in which candidates apply theory to practice. During the three quarters of field experiences (180 hours), candidates complete 10 activities expected of an administrator, document CPSEL performance, and complete an Equity Plan and Leadership Project. Candidates are formatively evaluated throughout every course and field experience on their progress toward the Mindscape outcomes. The cohort professor/team leader facilitates the field experience collaboration among the university supervisors, site principals, and candidates and is able to reinforce emerging skills during coursework and provide formative assessment.

Furthermore, candidates and graduates strongly voiced praise for the faculty, their involvement with the students' progress, and the feedback and mentorship they received in field experience.

Candidates are summatively evaluated on the Mindscapes as part of their final candidate competency assessment, the Portfolio Presentation. Candidate competence is verified through rubric feedback given on coursework activities and assignments, the Equity Plan, the year long Leadership Project, field experiences, and the final Mindscapes reflections. The team leader verifies completion of credential requirements and provides a recommendation for application for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential or Certificate of Eligibility. Candidates work with the Credential Student Services Center for the filing for the credential.

Findings on the Standards:
Interviews with leadership, faculty, university supervisors, site principals, current students and graduates, supported by written documents and artifacts, reveal that the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program and the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Internship Program are being delivered according to the CTC program standards. As a result, the reviewers determined that all Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program Standards are met with the exception of the following: Standard 7e.

Standard 7e was determined to be "Met with Concerns." The standard element states, "Authentic and significant experiences addressing a variety of school levels and a variety of school settings are required for each candidate." Although graduates and field supervisors reported the field experiences were positive, the reviewer found that candidates usually perform field experience at only one school level.

Professional Administrative Services Credential

Findings on Standards:
At CSU East Bay, the Professional Services Credential (PSC) is a separate program within the Department of Educational Leadership and offered through the Continuing Education Office. Candidates may use some of their coursework towards a Masters Degree. The Professional Services Credential Program is well established and operating efficiently.

The curriculum of the PSC program at CSUEB is organized around The California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs). These standards are integrated into the five department outcomes or "Mindscapes" and into the overall program goal of building, "Bold Socially Responsive Leaders." This overarching conception was established in 1988 and is

evident in the work and belief system of all students, graduates and faculty interviewed during the visit. The conception of "Bold, Socially Responsive Leaders" and five Mindscapes are aligned with the CTC Clear Administrative Services Credential Program Standards, and program faculty have developed rubrics for assessing candidate performance in each of the five outcome areas. Candidates in the program draw on their individual experiences as school leaders to design largely self-directed learning plans which are documented through a journal, a portfolio, mentoring and action research. The alignment between university studies and site practice is thorough. Candidates work with seasoned practitioners who serve as site mentors in their fieldwork activities, and program faculty work directly to deepen the students' learning throughout the program. Faculty keep in contact with many graduates as they continue to develop their leadership skills in schools and district offices.

Program documents indicate how the program meets or exceeds the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Standards-based Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential Programs. Candidates complete 18 units, nine in a Practicum of Assessment, Mentoring and Support, and three units each in Developing an Inquiring Community, Focus on Learning and Professional and Organizational Development. Candidates complete a Professional Learning Plan, professional journal and a final portfolio project. Candidates are in weekly contact with the fieldwork supervisor and meet in person on a Saturday once a month. The Professional Learning Plan is reviewed by the site mentor and the fieldwork supervisor at midterm.

In addition to outlining program design, philosophy and outcomes, the Department of Educational Leadership Professional Services Handbook describes all program policies and requirements including admission, coursework, and requirements for program completion. Coursework and fieldwork are described in sufficient detail to enable candidates to make informed decisions about individual learning plans. The required Administrative Professional Learning Plan and the Professional Learning Portfolio are described with illustrative examples. Students are encouraged to engage in serious self-reflection throughout the program as they develop the necessary self-confidence to be effective leaders. Further, the program purpose and outcomes are presented in a clear, interconnected chart that is given to students. Of particular interest is the students' commitment to equity and social justice in their professional practice.

Of note is the degree of penetration and longevity of the departmental philosophy and outcomes evident in interviews with the faculty, students and graduates. In all interviews, the reviewer uncovered an authentic commitment to the goal of "Bold Socially Responsive Leadership." Even graduates who have been away from the program for several years carry the belief in "bold" thoughtfully applied practice to improve student learning.

The authenticity of belief and uniformity of application struck the reviewer as a positive characteristic of the PSC program and the department as a whole. Also of note is the faculty's attention to maintaining contacts with graduates.

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty and staff, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Pupil Personnel Services Credential
School Counselor Specialization

Findings on Standards:
The Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program in School Counseling is within the College of Education and Allied Studies, Department of Education Psychology. The School Counseling Program is a two-year graduate program which consists of Master of Science in Counseling, Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) Credential in School Counseling, and coursework and training toward the Marriage and Family Therapy (MFT) Licensure. The PPS Cluster credential program has five full-time faculty members and two part-time training faculty.

The MS in Counseling with the School Counseling Credential is a two-year full-time, 90 unit program. CSU East Bay is committed to a training philosophy that promotes the educational and social-emotional development of all K-12 students. The program is designed to promote social justice and democracy by preparing knowledgeable and competent professional school counselors. Each year a cohort of approximately eight candidates is admitted to the Master's Program. The program design includes both theory and practice. Candidates indicate that they enjoy the small group seminars where they can discuss theory, role-play and analyze case studies. Students apply their knowledge through real-life educational settings in field studies courses and practicum field work. The program integrates training experiences that emphasize skills in cultural competency and staff/students use Blackboard as a resource for all aspects of the program. There was considerable evidence demonstrating placement of candidates in a variety of local school levels and settings.

Effective coordination was found among program faculty as evidenced by weekly faculty meetings and yearly PPS Advisory Panel meetings with community members. Three meetings are held a year with a Graduate Advisory Panel to provide feedback on the program.

The fieldwork requirement gives students the actual clinical assessment and counseling experience they need under the supervision of both licensed and/or credentialed professionals working in the field, and qualified department faculty. The University's Community Counseling Clinic provides opportunities to prepare students for careers in school counseling or therapy. Fieldwork competency evaluations are done on a continual basis with emphases upon integration and application of knowledge and skills. The program provides comprehensive and integrated assessment and evaluation through quarterly evaluations of each student by field supervisor and exit questionnaires. Multiple assessments are used which include continuous dialogue between university staff and field staff.

After students complete their coursework, fieldwork, and Praxis Exam requirements, the faculty evaluates candidates' professional and interpersonal maturity through a faculty review team. In addition, students develop a Professional Practice Portfolio to show evidence of their professional readiness.

After a review of the institutional report, university catalog, course syllabi, fieldwork handbook, professional portfolios; faculty vitae; support documentation and interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team has determined that all program standards are met for PPS Credential Specialization in School Counseling.

Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program
School Psychology plus Internship

Findings on Standards:
The School Psychology program at CSU East Bay has been in existence within the Department of Educational Psychology since 1972. In 1992, the program was expanded to include a third year of full-time (1200 hour) internship. In 1995, the program was granted full approval by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). At the end of the program, a successful candidate obtains a Master of Science degree in Counseling, a credential as a School Psychologist, and has 150 hours credit towards a license as a Marriage and Family Therapist (MFT). The three year program is based upon a quarter system and 153 course units are required.

The School Psychology/MS Counseling program at CSU East Bay is built on a foundation of social justice and democracy. Candidates begin their three year program with assignments in schools and under the immediate supervision of a district school psychologist. In the first year, students learn counseling and assessment skills with an assigned group of seven to ten students for a day and a half per week. The rationale for this process is that the candidate needs to balance academic coursework with hands-on experience with students. In the second year, the coursework continues, but the time in schools is increased to three days per week. Candidates may lead groups or do assessments and consult with the students' teachers and parents. In the third year, the candidate works full-time in the school setting, still under the supervision of both the local school psychologist and the university.

The curriculum of the program is based on a broad variety of coursework covering developmental psychology, cognitive-behavioral psychology, neuropsychology, counseling, consultation skills, cultural and linguistic influences, law and ethics. The program emphasizes six areas:
- Strength based intervention
- Child and Family advocacy
- Family/School/Community collaboration
- Cultural equity and pluralism
- Primary prevention
- Early intervention

Because the candidate begins his/her program with field experience, there is a strong expectation that there will be many opportunities to develop skills in group and individual counseling and assessment, as well as the development of consultative skills. The assessments done in the first year are used only for practice, not for placement. The candidates begin their portfolios as they begin their program, adding reports and other evidence of their proficiency in each quarter. By the time the candidate completes his/her third year, a complete portfolio is ready for review by the university. The portfolio is part of the qualification for the Master of Science degree which the candidate completes as he/she completes the credential program.

The candidate's competency is determined in several ways. Over the three year period of study, coursework performance, fieldwork evaluations, reviews by supervisors and faculty and formal reviews are used to determine competence. Candidates must complete 1200 hours of Internship in addition to the coursework and fieldwork. The final step in the process is the successful

completion of the Praxis II exam. Success on this is required for national certification. Upon satisfactory completion of the process, the candidate is recommended for a credential.

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential
Speech and Language Pathology

Findings on Standards:
The Clinical Rehabilitative Services: Speech and Language Pathology Credential authorizes the holder to work with individuals birth to 22 years of age who have language, speech and hearing disorders. The Communicative Sciences and Disorders program at CSU East Bay is part of the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences. The program is nationally accredited by the American Speech, Language, and Hearing Association (ASHA). Following completion of coursework, 400 clock hours of supervised practica, a Clinical Fellowship Year, and a passing score on the Praxis exam, candidates earn a Master of Sciences degree in Communicative Sciences and Disorders, the state license from the Speech Language Pathology and Audiology Board, national certification from ASHA, and the state credential. The coursework is offered on the quarter system and students must complete 80 units. Students may enter the program after earning a B.A./B.S. in Communicative Sciences and Disorders or they may enter a leveling program and complete the pre-requisite undergraduate work as a part-time or full-time student. The mission of the college includes an emphasis on excellence, instruction, adverse learning communities, the application of theory, and knowledge to practical and professional training situations.

The CSD program at CSU East Bay is part of the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences. Students begin classroom and fieldwork in the first quarter. Each fieldwork placement corresponds to coursework. Students move from 100% supervision in their first practicum to 35-40% supervision during their Clinical Fellowship Year. Throughout the two year program, students are assessed formally and informally via performance on course assignments and evaluations by fieldwork supervisors at both the campus and off-campus sites. Students have handbooks that clearly state criteria for passing performance in their coursework and fieldwork.

The curriculum is designed to meet national and state criteria. This includes an advanced understanding of speech, language, hearing disorders and differences including the etiologies, characteristics, anatomy/physiology, acoustic, psychological, developmental, linguistic and cultural correlates. Specific knowledge is demonstrated in articulation, fluency, voice/resonance, receptive/expressive language, hearing, social aspects of communication, augmentative and alternative forms of communication and assistive technology. After a five year research process, and a careful review of input from students, recent graduates, field supervisors, and employers, the program revised their curriculum this year. The new and/or revised courses are in the final stage of university approval and will be implemented in the Fall of 2010. The course changes reflect the changing population served in the schools by speech and language pathologists and the evolving changes in the profession. The four new or revised courses address working with children in the schools who have swallowing disorders, counseling with parents and families, diversity, and a course devoted to public school issues.

Findings on Standards:

After a review of the institutional report, biennial report and supporting documentation, and after conducting interviews with students, graduates, faculty, fieldwork supervisors, employers, and college administrators, the team determined that all program standards are met.